Speaker & Gavel

Volume 50 | Issue 1 Article 7

January 2013

Complete Issue 50(1)

Speaker & Gavel, 2013, 50 (1)

Speaker & Gavel

Volume 50, Issue 1, 2013

Speaker & Gavel, 2013, 50 (1)

Speaker & Gavel

Delta Sigma Rho—Tau Kappa Alpha
National Honorary Forensic Society
www.dsr-tka.org/

Editor

Stephen M. Croucher, Ph.D.
Department of Communication
University of Jyväskylä
Jyväskylä, Finland 40014
Stephen.m.croucher@jyu.fi

Editor's Note:
S&G went to an entire online format with volume 41/2004 of the journal. The journal will be available online at: www.dsr-tka.org/ The layout and design of the journal will *not* change in the online format. The journal will be available online as a pdf document. A pdf document is identical to a traditional hardcopy journal. We hope enjoy and utilize the format.

Speaker & Gavel, 2013, 50 (1)

Speaker & Gavel

http://www.dsr-tka.org/
Volume 50 (1) / 2013

Table of Contents

Speaker & Gavel

Delta Sigma Rho—Tau Kappa Alpha
National Honorary Forensic Society
www.dsr-tka.org/

Newspaper Coverage of the 2008 General Election Presidential Campaigns

William L. Benoit, Jayne R. Goode, & Mark Glantz

Abstract

News coverage of political campaigns is very important to the political campaign process. Some voters pay little attention to debates or other sources of information about the candidates and their policies. The news is one important source of this information. Newspapers can also supplement and reinforce the information possessed by voters who do attend to campaign messages. This study content analyzed news coverage of the 2008 general election presidential campaign (*New York Times, Washington Post, USA Today*). Horse race coverage was most common topic (45%), followed by themes about character (32%), and policy (23%). The tone of newspaper coverage was more positive (51%) than negative (39%; 9% of themes reported the candidates' defenses).

Key Terms: Newspaper coverage, 2008, presidential, general campaign

Introduction

Newspapers serve as an important source of information about presidential election campaigns. Hollihan (2001), for example, noted that "for national political news coverage, the most thorough, comprehensive, and substantive information regarding political campaigns, political issues, and public policies is available to readers of comprehensive large city daily papers" (p. 79). Hansen (2004) found that only 17 of 34 studies on newspaper use found a significant effect on learning. Nevertheless, his analysis of National Election Study (NES) data from 1960-2000 showed that newspaper use was associated with higher levels of knowledge in every one of these 11 campaigns. At a minimum, newspapers *can* be a significant source of issue knowledge for voters.

Furthermore, those who read newspapers may be a particularly important group of citizens to study. NES data from 2000 reveals those who read newspapers are more likely to vote in presidential elections than those who do not ($\chi^2[df = 1] = 101.93$, $p < .0001$, $V = .26$). This means newspaper users have a disproportionate impact at the polls. The 2000 election makes it plain that the outcome of close elections can be altered by a relatively small group of voters. Nor was 2000 the only close presidential election in recent years:

> In 1960, John Kennedy beat Richard Nixon by about 100,000 popular votes. This is a fraction of a percentage (0.2%) of the total vote. In 1968, Nixon defeated Hubert Humphrey by 500,000 votes (0.7%). In 1976, Jimmy Carter won by less than 2% of the popular vote. Polls in late September of 1976 showed an unusually large number of undecided voters... In 1980, Ronald Reagan beat Carter by less than 10% of the popular vote, yet two

> weeks before the election, 25% of the voters were still undecided. (Zakahi & Hacker, 1995, p. 100)

Thus, research on the content of newspaper coverage of presidential campaigns is clearly justified.

Specifically, the question of which topics are addressed in news coverage of political campaigns is an important one. Research has shown that the amount of coverage received by candidates, the tone of the coverage, and the amount of horse race coverage focusing on a candidate, can influence voters' perceptions of candidates (Ross, 1992). Furthermore, Farnsworth and Lichter (2003) observed "Polls have repeatedly shown that voters have a very good idea which candidate is likely to win the presidency, but voters are less able to demonstrate their knowledge of issue stands" (p. 53). But issue knowledge is arguably what voters need most: Patterson and McClure (1976) note "Of all the information voters obtain through the mass media during a presidential campaign, knowledge about where the candidates stand is most vital" (p. 49; see also Hofstetter, 1976). Therefore, the nature or content of newspaper coverage of presidential election campaigns merits scholarly attention.

Literature Review

Scholars have invested considerable effort into understanding news coverage of political campaigns. Some research investigates campaign coverage in television news (Farnsworth & Lichter, 2003; Hallin, 1992; Jamieson, Waldman, & Devitt, 1998; Just, Crigler, & Buhr, 1999; Kern, 1989; Lichter, Noyes, & Kaid, 1999; Patterson & McClure, 1976; Steele & Barnhurst, 1996). Primary campaign news coverage (Adams, 1987; Brady, 1989; Farnsworth & Lichter, 2003; Graber, 1988; Hofstetter & Moore, 1982; Johnson, 1993; King, 1990; Patterson, 1980; Robinson, 1980; Robinson & Lichter, 1991; Robinson & Sheehan, 1983) and coverage of nominating conventions (Adams, 1985; Benoit, Stein, & Hansen, 2004a; Patterson, 1980) have been investigated. Research has also investigated newspaper coverage of presidential debates (Benoit & Currie, 2001; Benoit, Hansen, & Stein, 2004a; Benoit, Stein, & Hansen, 2004b; Kaid, McKinney, & Tedesco, 2000; Patterson, 1980; Reber & Benoit, 2001). Other studies have investigated news coverage of non-presidential contests (Graber, 1989; Kahn & Kenney, 1999; Serini, Powers, & Johnson, 1998; West, 1994) and British elections (Coleman, 2011; Sinclair, 1982). Because the research we report here focuses on the nature of newspaper coverage of general presidential campaigns, we devote our attention to reviewing that literature.

One of the earliest studies published on campaign news coverage investigated the 1952 contest. Klein and Maccoby (1954) found that 60% of stories concerned policy or issues, 16% candidates' personal qualities (character), and 5% was about scandals. In the 1968 campaign, McCombs and Shaw (1972), who investigated television, newspaper, and magazine coverage, reported horse race was more common than substance (63% to 37%). Russonello and Wolf (1979) found 56% of newspaper coverage addressed the horse race, 22% was about policy, and 17% concerned the candidates' character. Graber (1971) re-

ported more stories discussed personal qualities (66%) than issues (34%) in 1968.

Using a somewhat different method (counting mentions instead of stories), Graber (1976) found virtually the same result in 1972: more mentions of candidate personal qualities (20,362) than of issues (11,187). Russonello and Wolf (1979) also looked at newspaper coverage of the 1976 presidential campaign. The largest category of articles was horse race (47%). The candidates' personal qualities (25%) and issues (21%) each received only about half as much attention as the horse race in the newspapers.

Robinson and Sheehan (1983) analyzed news coverage of the 1980 campaign from January through October, concluding:

> At every level, in every phase, during each and every month, CBS and UPI allocated more news space to competition between the candidates than to any other aspects of the campaign. . . . "Horse race" permeates almost everything the press does in covering elections and candidates. . . about five of every six campaign stories made some meaningful reference to the competition, but, by comparison, well over half of the same stories made no mention of issues. (p. 148)

They concluded that, combining both the primary and the general campaign (January through October), CBS and UPI devoted 65% of their coverage to the horse race, 26% to issues, and 10% to candidates (p. 149). Stovall's (1982) analysis of this campaign found that horse race themes accounted for 86% of newspaper coverage in 1980, with the remaining 14% about issues.

Stempel and Windhauser (1991) reported on the content of newspaper coverage of the 1984 and 1988 presidential campaigns. In 1984, issues comprised 39% of stories, followed by campaign events (35%), candidate character (21%), and horse race (5%). In 1988, issues dropped to 22%, campaign events were 34%, character 27%, and horse race (7%). Mantler and Whiteman (1995) reported that in 1992, issues accounted for 49.5% of newspaper coverage, followed by horse race at 41.4%, and character at 9.1%. Just, Crigler, and Buhr (1999) found 70% of newspaper campaign stories in 1992 referred to policy, 39% concerned horse race, and character was discussed in 34% of stories (stories could be classified in more than one category). Buchanan's (1991) analysis of the 1988 campaign found 65% of coverage concerned horse race, 18% policy, and 17% character. Farnsworth and Lichter (2011) examined the 2008 general election campaign, reporting that 41% of the coverage concerned the horse race and 35% policy.

Campaign coverage in five newspapers from 1888 to 1988 (sampled every 20 years) was investigated by Sigelman and Bullock (1991). They found candidate traits had remained relatively steady at about 10% of coverage. Policy issues accounted for about 25% coverage, with a small decrease starting in 1948. Campaign events accounted for about 40% of stories and this showed a slight drop over time. One of the main conclusions was "the meteoric rise of the horse race theme during the television era" (p. 21).

Benoit, Stein, and Hansen (2005) content analyzed *New York Times*' coverage of American presidential campaigns from 1952-2000. The most common topic concerned the horse race (40%), followed by character (31%), and policy (25%; voters, scandal, and election information accounted for the remaining 5% of themes). They analyzed horse race coverage into several specific topics, including strategy (34%), campaign events (24%), polls (22%), predictions (13%), endorsements (4%), expressions of vote choice (2%), fund raising (1%), and spending (0.3%). They also reported 39% of statements were positive, 57% negative, and 4% reported a candidate's defense. Benoit, Stein, McHale, Chattopadhyay, Verser, and Price (2007) replicated this analysis for the 2004 presidential campaign. Horse race themes constituted 59% of themes, with character and policy at about the same levels (19%, 20%). The three most common types of horse race coverage in 2004 were strategies (68%), polls (14%), and campaign events (5%). More evaluative statements were negative (58%) than positive (36%), with a few reports of defenses (5%). So, most studies indicate horse race is a more common topic than policy or character in coverage of American presidential campaigns; character is usually discussed more than policy, and the tone of coverage tends to be negative rather than positive.

This research is rich, examining newspaper coverage of many campaigns. Some conclusions can be drawn from this review. Most studies found horse race coverage was the most common topic of newspaper coverage of the presidential campaign. Second, more studies found policy was discussed more frequently than character. However, this work on news coverage of presidential campaigns has several limitations. First, most of these studies investigated only a single campaign. As just noted, some studies omitted categories and the categories were not defined uniformly in this research. Many of these studies do not report any evidence of reliability. Some appear to report only simple agreement, which can over-estimate reliability because of the potential for chance agreement (Riffe, Lacy, & Fico, 1998). Only one study reported a reliability statistic which controlled for chance agreement (Sigelman & Bullock, 1991).

Before turning attention to the purpose and method, the question of bias in news coverage of political campaigns deserves mention. D'Alessio and Allen (2000) conducted a meta-analysis on the research, investigating whether candidates from one political party receive more coverage than candidates from the other political party. The authors report no overall bias in the literature.

> This is not to say that every reporter and every newspaper is unbiased. Quite the opposite: A wide variety of data (Shoemaker & Reese, 1991; White, 1950; Millspaugh, 1949) indicates that specific newspapers or specific reporters and editors can show substantial (and substantive) ideological bias.... What the results of this meta-analysis do say is that on the whole, across all newspapers and all reporters, there is only negligible, if any, net bias in the coverage of presidential campaigns. (p. 148)

Therefore, although there may be a bias favoring one party in a given news outlet or during a particular campaign, the research does not support a conclusion of an overall bias in news coverage of political candidates.

Purpose

This study extends the work of Benoit, Stein, and Hansen (2007) and Benoit et al. (2007) to the 2008 presidential campaign. We ask the following questions:

RQ1. What are the topics of newspaper coverage of the 2008 presidential campaign?

RQ2. What is the relative proportion of the forms of horse race coverage in the 2008 presidential campaign?

RQ3. What is the relative proportion of negative and positive tone (and the frequency of defense) in newspaper coverage of the 2008 presidential campaign?

Together the answers to these questions will enhance our understanding of newspaper coverage of the 2008 presidential campaign.

Method

Sample

Election day in 2008 occurred on Tuesday, November 4. Our sample comprised two constructed weeks (see Riffe, Lacy, & Fico, 1998) leading up to election day: July 22 Tuesday, July 30 Wednesday, August 7 Thursday, August 15 Friday, August 23 Saturday, August 31 Sunday, September 8 Monday, September 16 Tuesday, September 24 Wednesday, October 2 Thursday, October 10 Friday, October 18 Saturday, October 26 Sunday, November 3 Monday. "McCain" and "Obama" were the search terms employed in the search. Three national newspapers were sampled: *New York Times*, *Washington Post*, and *USA Today*. Lexis-Nexis Academic University was employed to obtain the sample.

Method

Content analysis was employed to describe the content of these news stories. We followed the procedures set forth in Benoit, Stein, and Hansen (2005) and followed in Benoit et al. 2007); Benoit's Functional Theory (2007) served as the theoretical starting point. This theory posits that candidate discourse has only three functions (acclaims, or positive statements; attacks, or negative statements; and defenses, or refutations of attacks). It also holds that candidate messages will address two topics, policy (issues) and character (image). This framework was extended to include horse race as a topic and the notion that horse race coverage can be divided into eight sub-categories: strategy, campaign events, polls, predictions, endorsements, vote choice, fund raising, and spending.

The codebook from Benoit, Stein, and Hansen (2005) was employed for this study, with definitions of these categories and an example of each category from newspaper stories not part of our sample; examples of each category taken from

the codebook are supplied in the Appendix. Coders unitized the texts into themes, which are the smallest units of discourse capable of expressing an idea. Berelson (1952) noted a theme is "an assertion about a subject" (p. 18). Holsti (1969) wrote that a theme is "a single assertion about some subject" (p. 116). Each theme was coded for general topic. Horse race themes were further identified as type of horse race. Comments with evaluative content (positive or negative) and defenses were also identified.

Cohen's (1960) κ was calculated (on a subset 10% of the texts) to determine inter-coder reliability because it controls for agreement by chance. Reliability for topic was .97, κ was .85 for form of horse race coverage. The κ for tone ranged from .88 to .95; for tone it ranged from .74-.97 (reliability is reported as a range because multiple coders analyzed the texts). Landis and Koch (1977) explained values of κ between .61 and .80 reflect substantial agreement among coders; κs over .81 represents almost perfect reliability. One-way χ^2 was used to test difference in the frequencies of the categories. Frequency data was converted to ratio data (percentages) to test for longitudinal shifts.

Results

The first research question investigated the topics of newspaper articles on presidential campaigns. The most frequent topic was horse race (45%); this was followed by discussions of the candidates' character (32%) and policies (23%). Comments about voters, scandal, and election information were comparatively rare and for that reason excluded from statistical analysis. It was obvious that the three largest categories were more frequent than the others; the smallest three categories together comprised less than 5% of the utterances in the sample. A one-way *chi-square* limited to the three most common topics confirms that they occurred with different frequencies (χ^2 [*df* = 2] = 32.91, $p < .0001$). These data are displayed in Table 1.

Table 1. *Topics of 2008 General Campaign Coverage*

	Horse Race	Character	Policy
2008 *NYT, WP, UAST*	205 (45%)	**147 (32%)**	106 (23%)
2008 Debates	--	357 (30%)	**850 (70%)**
2008 TV Spots	--	323 (42%)	**452 (58%)**
1952-2000 *NYT*	1332 (41%)	1042 (32%)	851 (26%)

2008 debates spots from Rill & Benoit (2009); 2008 TV Spots from Benoit & Glantz (2012); 1952-2000 from Benoit, Stein, & Hansen (2005)

The second research question investigated the type of horse race comments in these stories. Strategy and campaign events were the most common forms at 28% and 27% respectively. The next most common topics of horse race coverage were spending (15%) and fund-raising (14%). Polls were discussed in 8% of themes; predictions, endorsements, and discussions of vote choices each comprised less than 5% of themes. Table 2 displays these data. There was a significant difference in the distribution of these topics (χ^2 [*df* = 7] = 105.46, $p < .0001$).

Table 2. *Type of Horse Race Coverage in 2008*

	Strategy	Events	Poll	Predict	Endorse	Vote Choice	Fund Raise	Spend
2008 *NYT, WP, UAST*	49 (28%)	47 (27%)	14 (8%)	6 (3%)	7 (4%)	4 (2%)	24 (14%)	26 (15%)
1952-2000 *NYT*	457 (34%)	320 (24%)	291 (22%)	160 (13%)	59 (4%)	1 (1%)	0	0

1952-2000 from Benoit, Stein, & Hansen (2005)

The tone of newspaper campaign coverage was the topic of the final research question. Positive tone (51%) was more common than negative tone (39%); a few utterances reported on defenses (9%). Statistical analysis reveals that excluding defenses, negative comments were significantly more common than positive ones (χ^2 [df = 1] = 4.14, p < .05).

Table 3. *Tone of 2008 General Campaign Coverage*

	Positive	Negative	Defensive
2008 *NYT, WP, UAST*	140 (51%)	107 (39%)	25 (9%)
2008 Debates	750 (58%)	457 (35%)	97 (7%)
2008 TV Spots	279 (34%)	505 (65%)	3 (0.4%)
1952-2000 *NYT*	803 (39%)	1177 (57%)	79 (4%)

1952-2000 from Benoit, Stein, & Hansen (2005)

Discussion

As in most of the previous research, the most common topic of newspaper coverage of the 2008 presidential campaign was the horse race, which accounted for 45% of themes in this sample. Why do the media focus more on horse race rather than on substantive issues? Graber (1989) explains a survey of newspaper and television editors found the three most important factors in choosing whether to air or print a story are conflict, proximity, and timeliness: "Conspicuously absent from their choice criteria was the story's overall significance" (p. 86). Furthermore, Patterson explains "Policy problems lack the novelty that the journalist seeks. . . . The first time that a candidate takes a position on a key issue, the press is almost certain to report it. Further statements on the same issue become progressively less newsworthy, unless a new wrinkle is added" (1994, p. 61). In the 2008 campaign, for example, the first time a candidate discussed Iraq,that was news. However, later discussions of this topic were simply not as newsworthy as the initial announcement, even if they contained more specific details about Bush's plans. This emphasis on the horse race matters: Farnsworth and Lichter (2003) observed voters have better knowledge of where the candidates stand in the polls than where they stand on the issues. News' emphasis of horse race over issues surely contributes to the state of voter knowledge.

Similarly, newspaper stories were more likely to discuss the candidates' character (32%) than their policy positions (23%). As in past studies, when these stories address the horse race they were most likely to discuss strategies and campaign events. There could be other serious effects on the electorate from the

nature of presidential campaign coverage. Capella and Jamieson's research suggests "strategy frames for news activate cynicism" in the audience (p. 159). They caution the effect is relatively small and at times only approaches significance but it is consistent. They also note "the effect occurs for broadcast as well as print news, and. . . the combination is additive" (p. 159). Furthermore, analysis of the general election TV spots from 2008 (Benoit & Glantz, 2012) reveals that the advertisements from McCain and Obama stressed policy more than character (58% to 42%). Hence, the newspapers' emphasis on character did not reflect the emphasis of these topics in the election; it was a deliberate choice by the newspapers. The emphasis on campaign strategy may not be a desirable feature of newspaper coverage: We do need to know about the candidates' character, but they propose and administer policy for the federal government.

One noticeable difference between horse race coverage in 2008 and coverage of earlier campaigns is that fund-raising and spending were much more common (and remaining categories tended to be less common) that in earlier campaigns. Much of this shift can be attributed to Obama's campaign: Salant (2008) reported that in the 2008 general election campaign, "Obama... spent $740.6 million, eclipsing the combined $646.7 million that Republican President George W. Bush and Democratic nominee John Kerry spent four years earlier" (Salant, 2008). So, Obama raised and spent more than any other candidate for president – and in fact raised and spent more than the previous two candidates together. In that light it makes sense for news coverage to focus on these two categories more than in past elections.

Another difference in 2008 is that the newspaper coverage had more positive than negative evaluative comments. This could be a reaction to complaints about the negativity of election coverage. It is surprising to see the candidates in their TV spots attacked more than they acclaimed (65% to 34%; Benoit & Glantz, 2012). Furthermore, a study by Ansolabehere, Iyengar, Simon, and Valentino (1994; see also Ansolabehere & Iyengar, 1995) concluded negative advertising reduced voter turnout. However, this study did not analyze the content of *television advertising*; instead, it analyzed the content of *news stories about the campaign*. Therefore, although the authors claimed to have shown that negative advertising reduced turnout, in fact their study demonstrated *negative news coverage depressed turnout*. It is possible the negativity of newspaper coverage of the presidential campaign could have the same pernicious effect. However, voter turnout was higher in 2008 than in recent years (United States Elections Project, 2011), perhaps in part because of the positive coverage of the campaign.

One limitation of the study was our approach to sampling. Using constructed weeks allowed us to investigate a longer time period than other studies of one or two campaigns, but there is a trade-off because we did not content analyze as many stories from each campaign. Furthermore, using the names of the Democratic and Republican nominees could have reduced the number of stories in the sample concerning third party candidates (e.g., George Wallace, John Anderson, Ross Perot, Ralph Nader). Another limitation is that the sample only included news stories from the *New York Times*. It is clear that this is not a typical newspaper; however, arguably it is a particularly important one.

Conclusion

This study added to our understanding of news coverage of American presidential elections, content analyzing a sample of stories on the general election in the *New York Times*, the *Washington Post*, and *USA Today*. Newspaper coverage of the election is an important source of information about the candidates and the policies they embrace. As noted earlier, newspaper readers are more likely to vote, exerting more influence in the voting booth than non-readers. The most common information supplied to readers concerned the horse race between the candidates (45% of all themes). The *news* prefers to emphasize the competition and that which changes every day (e.g., where the candidates are holding events). Less information is provided in newspapers on the candidates' character (32%) and policies (23%). Strategy and campaign events were the most common topics, followed by fund raising and spending – probably because Obama raised and spent more money than any other presidential candidate in history. Unusually, this campaign coverage had more positive than negative evaluative comments.

Newspaper coverage of the general election campaign in 2008 followed some of the trends established by previous research, but some differences (e.g., tone) emerged. In the 2012 campaign, neither candidate accepted federal financing for the general election. It will be interesting to see if an increase in importance on fund raising by candidates will be reflected in newspaper coverage of the 2012 general presidential election.

References

Adams, W. C. (1985). Convention coverage. In M. J. Robinson & A. Ranney (Eds.), *The mass media in campaign '84* (pp. 18-23). Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute.

Adams, W. C. (1987). "As New Hampshire goes..." In G. R. Orren & N. W. Polsby (Eds.), *Media and momentum: The New Hampshire primary and nomination politics* (pp. 42-59). Chatham, NJ: Chatham House.

Ansolabehere, S., & Iyengar, S. (1995). *Going negative: How attack ads shrink and polarize the electorate*. New York: Free Press.

Ansolabehere, S., Iyengar, S., Simon, A., & Valentino, N. (1994). Does attack advertising demobilize the electorate? *American Political Science Review, 88*(4), 829-838.

Benoit, W. L. (1999). *Seeing spots: A functional analysis of presidential television advertisements, 1952-1996*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Benoit, W. L., & Currie, H. (2001). Inaccuracies in media coverage of the 1996 and 2000 presidential debates. *Argumentation and Advocacy, 38*(1), 28-39.

Benoit, W. L., & Glantz, M. (2012). A functional analysis of 2008 general election presidential TV spots. *Speaker & Gavel, 49*(1), 1-19.

Benoit, W. L., Hansen, G. J., & Stein, K. A. (2004). Newspaper coverage of presidential primary debates. *Argumentation and Advocacy, 40*(4), 246–258.

Benoit, W. L., McHale, J. P., Hansen, G. J., Pier, P. M., & McGuire, J. (2003). *Campaign 2000: A functional analysis of the presidential campaign at the dawn of the new millennium*. Lanhan, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Benoit, W. L., Pier, P. M., Brazeal, L. M., McHale, J. P., Klyukovski, A., & Airne, D. (2002). *The primary decision: A functional analysis of debates in presidential primaries*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Benoit, W. L., & Stein, K. A. (2005). A functional analysis of presidential direct mail advertising. *Communication Studies,* 56(3), *203-225*.

Benoit, W. L., Stein, K. A., & Hansen, G. J. (2004a). How newspapers cover presidential nomination acceptance addresses. *Newspaper Research Journal*, *25*(3), 83-89.

Benoit, W. L., Stein, K. A., & Hansen, G. J. (2004b). Newspaper coverage of presidential debates. *Argumentation and Advocacy, 41*(1), 17-27.

Benoit, W. L., Stein, K. A., & Hansen, G. J. (2005). *New York Times* coverage of presidential campaigns. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly, 82*(2), 356-376.

Benoit, W. L., Stein, K. A., McHale, J. P., Chattopadhyay, S., Verser, R., Price, S. (2007). *Bush versus Kerry: A functional analysis of campaign 2004*. New York: Peter Lang.

Benoit, W. L., & Wells, W. T. (1996). *Candidates in conflict: Persuasive attack and defense in the 1992 presidential debates*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.

Benoit, W. L., Blaney, J. R., & Pier, P. M. (1999). Acclaiming, attacking, and defending in nomination convention acceptance addresses, 1960-1996. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 85*(3), 247-267.

Berelson, B. (1952). *Content analysis for the social sciences and humanities*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Brady, H. E. (1989). Is Iowa news? In P. Squire (Ed.) *The Iowa caucuses and the presidential nominating process* (pp. 89-119). Boulder, CO: Westview.

Buchanan, B. (1991). *Electing a president: The Markle Commission research on campaign '88*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Capella, J. N., & Jamieson, K. H. (1997). *Spiral of cynicism: The press and the public good*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Cohen, J. (1960). A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 20*, 37-46.

Coleman, S. (2011). *Leaders in the living room: The Prime Ministerial debates of 2010: Evidence, evaluation, and some recommendations*. Oxford: Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism.

D'Alessio, D., & Allen, M. (2000). Media bias in presidential elections: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Communication, 50*(4), 133-156.

Farnsworth, S. J., & Lichter, S. R. (2003). *The nightly news nightmare: Network television's coverage of U.S. presidential elections, 1988-2000*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Farnsworth, S. J., & Lichter, S. R. (2011). Network television's coverage of the 2008 presidential campaign. *American Behavioral Scientist, 55*, 354-370.

Graber, D. A. (1971). Press coverage patterns of campaign news: The 1968 presidential race. *Journalism Quarterly, 48*(3), 502-512.

Graber, D. A. (1976). Effect of incumbency on coverage patterns in 1972 presidential campaign. *Journalism Quarterly, 53*(3), 499-508.

Graber, D. A. (1988). *Processing the news: How people tame the information tide* (2nd ed.). White Plains, NY: Longman.

Graber, D. A. (1989). *Mass media and American politics* (3rd ed.). Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly.

Hallin, D. (1992). Sound bite news: Television coverage of elections, 1968-1988. *Journal of Communication, 42(2),* 5-24.

Hansen, G. J. (2004). *The informational function of communicative sources in presidential campaigns: Effects on issue knowledge and character evaluation*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Missouri.

Hofstetter, C. R. (1976). *Bias in the news: Network television coverage of the 1972 election campaign*. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press.

Hofstetter, C. R., & Moore, D. W. (1982). Television coverage of presidential primaries. *Journalism Quarterly, 59*, 651-654.

Hollihan, T. A. (2001). *Uncivil wars: Political campaigns in a media age*. Boston: Bedford/St. Martins.

Holsti, O. (1952). *Content analysis in communication research*. New York: Free Press.

Jamieson, K. H., & Waldman, P. (2003). *The press effect: Politicians, journalists, and the stories that shape the political world*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jamieson, K. H., Waldman, P., & Devitt, J. (1998). Mapping the discourse of the 1996 US presidential general election. *Media, Culture, & Society, 20*(2), 323-328.

Johnson, T. J. (1993). Filling out the racing form: How the media covered the horse race in the 1988 primaries. *Journalism Quarterly, 70*(2), 300-310.

Just, M., Crigler, A., & Buhr, T. (1999). Voice, substance, and cynicism in presidential campaign media. *Political Communication, 16*(1), 25-44.

Kahn, K. F., & Kenney, P. J. (1999). *The spectacle of U.S. Senate campaigns*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Kaid, L. L., McKinney, M., & Tedesco, J. C. (2000). *Civic dialogue in the 1996 presidential campaign: Candidate, media, and public voices*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Kern, M. (1989). *30 second politics: Political advertising in the eighties*. New York: Praeger.

King, E. G. (1990). Thematic coverage of the 1988 presidential primaries: A comparison of *USA Today* and the *New York Times*. *Journalism Quarterly, 67*(1), 83-87.

Klein, M. W., & Maccoby, N. (1954). Newspaper objectivity in the 1952 campaign. *Journalism Quarterly, 31*, 285-296.

Landis, J. R., & Koch, G. G. (1977). The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data. *Biometrica, 33*, 159-174.

Lichter, S. R., & Noyes, R. E. (1995). *Good intentions make bad news: Why Americans hate campaign journalism*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Lichter, S. R., Noyes, R. E., & Kaid, L. L. (1999). No news or negative news: How the networks nixed the '96 campaign. In L. L. Kaid & D. G. Bystrom (Eds.), *The electronic election: Perspectives on the 1996 campaign communication* (pp. 3-13). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Mantler, G., & Whiteman, D. (1995). Attention to candidates and issues in newspaper coverage of 1992 presidential campaign. *Newspaper Research Journal, 16*, 14-28.

McCombs, M. E., & Shaw, D. L. (1972). The agenda setting function of the mass media. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 36*(2), 176-187.

Millspaugh, M. (1949). Baltimore newspapers and the presidential election. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 13*, 122-123.

Patterson, T. E. (1980). *The mass media election: How Americans choose their president*. New York: Praeger.

Patterson, T. E. (1994). *Out of order*. New York: Random House, Vintage Books.

Patterson, T. E., & McClure, R. D. (1973). Political advertising on television: Spot commercials in the 1972 presidential election. *Maxwell Review*, 57-69.

Patterson, T. E., & McClure, R. D. (1976). *The unseeing eye: The myth of television power in national politics*. New York: Putnam.

Reber, B. H., & Benoit, W. L. (2001). Presidential debate stories accentuate the negative. *Newspaper Research Journal, 22*(3), 30-43.

Riffe, D., Lacy, S., & Fico, F. G. (1998). *Analyzing media messages: Using quantitative content analysis in research*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Rill, L., & Benoit, W. L. (2009). *A functional analysis of 2008 general election debates*. Chicago, IL: National Communication Association.

Robinson, M. J. (1980). Media coverage in the primary campaign of 1976. In W. Crotty (Ed.), *The party symbol: Readings on political parties* (pp. 178-191). San Francisco, CA: Freeman.

Robinson, M. J., & Lichter, S. R. (1991). "The more things change...": Network news coverage of the 1988 presidential nomination races. In E. M. Buell & L. Sigelman (Eds.), *Nominating the president* (pp. 196-212). Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee Press.

Robinson, M. J., & Sheehan, M. A. (1983). *Over the wire and on TV: CBS and UPI in campaign '80*. New York: Russell Sage.

Ross, M. H. (1992). Television news and candidate fortunes in presidential nominating campaigns: The case of 1984. *American Politics Quarterly, 20*, 69-98.

Russonello, J. M., & Wolf, F. (1979). Newspaper coverage of the 1976 and 1968 presidential campaigns. *Journalism Quarterly, 56*(2), 360-364, 432.

Salant, J. D. (2008, December 27). Spending doubled as Obama led a billion dollar campaign. Accessed 10/23/11: http://www.bloomberg.com/apps/news?pid=newsarchive&sid=anLDS9WWPQW8/

Serini, S. A., Powers, A. A., & Johnson, S. (1998). Of horse race and policy issues: A study of gender in coverage of a gubernatorial election by two major metropolitan newspapers. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly, 75*(1), 194-204.

Shoemaker, P. J., & Reese, S. D. (1991). *Mediating the message: Theories of influences on mass media content*. New York: Longman.

Sigelman, L., & Bullock, D. (1991). Candidates, issues, horse races, and hoopla: Presidential campaign coverage, 1988-1988. *American Politics Quarterly, 19*(1), 5-32.

Sinclair, K. (1982). "Horserace" vs. "Substance" in coverage of elections by British prestige press. *Journalism Quarterly, 59*(4, 598-602.

Stempel, G. H., & Windhauser, J. W. (1991). Newspaper coverage of the 1984 and 1988 campaigns. In G. H. Stempel & J. W. Windhauser (Eds.), *The media in the 1984 and 1988 presidential campaigns* (pp. 13-66). New York: Greenwood Press.

Stovall, J. G. (1982). Foreign policy issue coverage in the 1980 presidential campaign. *Journalism Quarterly, 59*(4), 531-540.

United States Election Project. (2011). Voter turnout. Retrieved from http://elections.gmu.edu/voter_turnout.htm

West, D. M. (1994). Political advertising and news coverage in the 1992 California U.S. Senate campaign. *Journal of Politics, 56*(4), 1053-1075.

White, D. M. (1950). The gate-keeper: A case study in the selection of news. *Journalism Quarterly, 27*, 383-390.

Zakahi, W. R., & Hacker, K. L. (1995). Televised presidential debates and candidate images. In K. L. Hacker, (Ed.), *Candidate images in presidential elections* (pp. 99-122). Westport, CT: Praeger.

Authors' Note: William L. Benoit, Ohio University, Jayne R. Goode, University of Dayton, and Mark Glantz, St. Norbert College.

Obama Transforming: Using Functional Theory to Identify Transformational Leadership

Kristina Drumheller & Greg G. Armfield

Abstract

The 2008 presidential campaign convention speeches broke records as viewers flocked to the speeches by Obama, Palin, and McCain in numbers that rivaled *American Idol* ratings. Adapting functional theory (Benoit, 2007) to include transformational leadership characteristics (Bass & Avolio, 1990), President Obama's 2008 nomination acceptance speech was used test the adapting of functional theory for analyzing leadership claims. Secondary data were used as evidentiary support of Obama's efforts to make changes once in the White House. Results are discussed and framed within functional theory and transformational leadership.

Keywords: transformational leadership, functional theory, convention speech, political, rhetoric

Introduction

In presidential campaigns, candidates are expected to argue that they are going to make substantive changes from the previous administration, whether as an extension of public policies with high approval ratings or distancing from negatively viewed policies and administrations. In the 2008 presidential election, both the Republican and Democratic nominees felt the need to distance themselves from the Bush administration and offer real change, in new directions from the current policies. Obama, in particular, had to convince the American public that he not only had experience, but the right kind of experience for the substantive change he felt America needed; change that included electing a black man as president for the first time in U.S. history. Studies on the transformational leadership of presidents are few (e.g., House, Spangler, & Woycke, 1991; Wendt & Fairhurst, 1994) with limited methods for analyzing leadership rhetoric. This study seeks, first, to expand on the methods of analysis for transformational leadership by suggesting that functional theory can be adapted to look more in depth at leadership characteristics. It is expected that functional theory could be similarly adapted to explore other characteristics more fully, such as defense posturing or strategic planning, to go beyond what messages are being constructed to what those messages actually say about the presidential ability. Second, this study seeks to test the adapted theory to identify claims of leadership in Barack Obama's 2008 nomination acceptance speech. As such, we believe that in order to best evaluate the transformational nature of political leadership, it is important to both analyze a leader's words and behaviors. Secondary data are used for evidentiary support of the challenges faced by Obama in transforming the White House.

Rationale

It has become standard in recent campaigns that candidates must at least appear to be transformational (Wendt & Fairhurst, 1994). Past presidents have been identified as transformational leaders (e.g., Abraham Lincoln), but with little research on the campaign messages or inaugural addresses that got them to the White House. Adding to the limited studies conducted that have questioned the leadership styles of presidential candidates, we seek to extend the use of functional theory (Benoit, 2007) as a tool for identifying transformational leadership acclaims and attacks to the contrary.

Nomination speeches are recognized as representative of a candidate's campaign and are valued by scholars because of their wide reach and presentation of a candidate's social and political agendas (Daughton, 1994). In fact, the acceptance speech "is often regarded by politicians and critical observers as the most important address of a candidate's campaign" (Scheele, 1984, p. 51). It is not uncommon that singular nomination acceptance speeches are rhetorically analyzed (Houck, 1997; Scheele, 1984), or rhetorical and content analysis comparisons of speeches offered (Daughton, 1994; Östman, 2012; Petrocik, Benoit, & Hansen, 2003-2004). Nomination acceptance speeches often attract the largest audience for the campaign, which is true of Obama's acceptance speech, which was watched by over 38 million viewers. Additionally, nomination acceptance speeches "are not as partisan as conventional wisdom might suggest" (Petrocik et al., 2003/2004, p. 610). The speeches tend to be celebrations of the nomination with more coverage of a wider range of issues.

Acceptance speeches also serve to frame the individual embodiment of the office. Houck's (1997) analysis suggests that Franklin Delano Roosevelt's 1932 nomination acceptance speech served to show physical ability, despite a disability, to serve as president. In similar vein, Obama's acceptance speech acknowledged, "the vision of where America is headed is infused with historical and even mythic purpose" (Dilliplane, 2012, p. 143) as he stood to prove that race was no longer a barrier to the executive office. Today's televised nomination speeches reach millions, providing candidates with an opportunity to articulate vision as leader of the free world without the time constraints of advertisements and debates (Petrocik et al., 2003). The claims of leadership inherent in this type of address are thus worth exploring, which can be done by expanding the scope of functional theory to include transformational leadership characteristics as defined by Bass (1985).

Transformational leadership studies on presidential and presidential candidate rhetoric are limited, with most transformational leadership studies conducted in corporate settings (e.g., Jiang, 2012; Levine, Muenchent, & Brooks, 2010; Pillai, Schriesham, & Williams, 1999), and more recently educational settings (Bolkan & Goodboy, 2011), using both quantitative and qualitative analysis techniques. House et al. (1991) conducted a thorough analysis of charismatic presidential rhetoric while Wendt and Fairhurst (1994) rhetorically analyzed the leadership styles of the 1992 presidential candidates. This study seeks to take such research efforts a step further by using an adapted version of functional theory to analyze the leadership claims made by a nominated candidate and the

challenges faced once elected. Presidents rely on public opinion, which makes transformational leadership characteristics important for achieving political goals. A review of relevant literature is followed by an analysis and discussion of Obama's presidential rhetoric.

The Function of Transformational Leadership

Transformational leadership is one of the models of charismatic leadership (House et al., 1991; Northouse, 2013) and is one of the most researched leadership theories (Aldoory & Toth, 2004; Antonakis, 2012; Barbuto & Burbach, 2006). It focuses on the exchange between leader and follower, where the leader engages with followers in order to "create a connection that raises the level of motivation and morality in both the leader and the follower" (Northouse, 2013, p. 186). Based on the work of House (1976) and Burns (1978), Bass (1985) notably expanded transformational leadership by describing transactional (related to goal attainment) and transformational leadership as a single continuum. Although charisma is a necessary part of transformational leadership, it is not a sufficient condition (Yammariono, 1993). Four factors of transformational leadership have been identified by scholars: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individual consideration (Bass, 1985; Wendt & Fairhurst, 1994).

Idealized influence, or charisma, is the emotional component (Antonakis, 2012). The leader is viewed as a strong role model and followers seek to emulate the leader. "These leaders usually have very high standards of moral and ethical conduct and can be counted on to do the right thing" (Northouse, 2013, p. 191). They gain followers' trust and are able to encourage others to follow their mission or vision and generally engage moral higher reasoning (Avolio, 2005; Bass & Steidlmeier, 1998). Although often conflated with charismatic leadership, researchers caution that transformational leadership is not just due to charisma. "Because charisma is a relationship and not a personality characteristic of leaders, charisma exists only because followers say it does or followers behave in specific ways" (House et al., 1991, p. 366). Thus, transformational leadership relies heavily on the perception of followers.

Followers are inspired to commit to a leader's vision of a "more desirable future" (Avolio, 2005, p. 196) through the use of symbols and pathos as a result of the second factor, which is inspirational motivation. The leader takes the focus off of self-interest and places it on team effort. Inspirational leaders are not afraid to take risks to achieve their vision and are able to motivate others to join them on the journey. This is done through intellectual stimulation, the third factor, by asking followers to be creative and innovative. In so doing, followers should also continuously challenge their own beliefs and the beliefs of the leader and organization. The goal of sharing diverse ideas is to generate "the highest levels of creativity from one's followers" (Avolio, 2005, p. 197). Transformational leaders ultimately encourage followers to look at problems in new ways (Avolio & Gibbons, 1988) and "are distinguished by their risk taking, goal articulation, high expectations, emphasis on collective identity, self-assertion, and vision" (Aldoory & Toth, 2004, p. 159). These factors are dependent on the rela-

tional aspects of leader communication, or individualized consideration. Leaders appear supportive by listening to the needs of followers and communicating expressively: getting to know those with whom they work to be supportive where necessary, but also challenging to help followers in their own development as leaders. The leader might delegate and motivate so followers begin to take their own initiative to the point of no longer needing to rely on a leader.

Transformational leadership has been evaluated in various contexts from educational settings to corporate organizations, with less attention given to political leadership. Bolkan and Goodboy (2011) studied transformational leadership in the classroom and found that instructors who personalized content and challenged students to engage in critical thinking were perceived to be dynamic transformational leaders. Corporate leaders have been perceived as transformational based on their use of bureaucracy, norms, symbols, rituals, and establishment of trust as instruments of organizational change: cultural factors which are likewise available to political leaders (Wendt & Fairhurst, 1994). But, unlike instructors and many organizational leaders, political leaders work closely with legislators and foreign leaders and present a "very public campaign in which he or she goes on the record in terms of a proposed vision and political vision" (Wendt & Fairhurst, 1994, p. 185). Understandably, this public image challenges presidential efforts to be innovative in a divisive political system.

Expectations of political leadership have evolved as "leaders frame and shape the context of a situation using actions and utterances" (Witherspoon, 1997, p. 6) to manage meaning using greater stylistic trends and social media in contemporary presidential campaigns. Leaders manage meaning as interpreters, educators, and advocates (Witherspoon, 1997); political leaders in particular are expected to have "a vision" that manages meanings "about the future direction of the country. However, to manage meaning about future directions is also to create a set of expectations for behavior or action to follow. The anticipated outcome is successfully managed change once in office" (Wendt & Fairhurst, 1994, p. 181). Identifying transformational leadership claims in campaign rhetoric can be useful as strategists and constituents evaluate the candidate's transition from "idealism and interpretive strategies" (Wendt & Fairhurst, 1994, p. 192) of campaigns to the bureaucratic complexities of governing inherent in our political structure.

Political transformational leaders. Political leaders have often been identified as transformational (e.g., House et al., 1991; Wendt & Fairhurst, 1994) by getting followers to value idealized goals, transcend self-interest for the sake of the organization, and move followers toward higher-level needs (Bass, 1985; 1990). Transformational leaders are able to command the attention of followers and communicate a vision which others are willing to follow while simultaneously empowering others to take part in that vision (Bennis, 1984). Presidential campaigns offer candidates the opportunity to address important issues facing the nation.

The 2008 presidential contest was an historical moment with Obama communicating a vision of the American dream that included breaking race barriers.

Although race discourse was limited in Obama's nomination acceptance speech, key speeches throughout the campaign provided the potential for Obama to demonstrate transformational leadership qualities. Dilliplane (2012) argues that Obama's *A More Perfect Union* speech was "a beacon moment designed to resonate with overarching campaign themes consistently reiterating who and what Obama's candidacy represented" (p. 146). It is likely Obama's acceptance speech furthers the rhetoric encompassed by key moments in his campaign (Dilliplane, 2012; Howell, 2011).

Key campaign moments can bring leadership potential into view with the transactional/transformational continuum used to identify effective political leadership styles. "In exchanging promises for votes, the transactional leader works within the framework of the self-interests of his or her constituency, whereas the transformational leader moves to change the framework" (Bass, 1990). According to Bass (1990), President Lincoln was willing to shift paradigms to keep the Union together, where his predecessor, James Buchanan, would allow the Union to disintegrate to stay the course. Jimmy Carter and Herbert Hoover exemplify competent presidents who failed to inspire, while John F. Kennedy and Franklin Delano Roosevelt were less intellectual but far more inspirational, and able to stimulate creativity and commitment in others (Bass, 1990). Despite the dichotomous beginnings under Burns (1978), Bass (1985) suggests that a leader can be transformational and still be transactional; that is, a presidential candidate can still promise transactional things like lower taxes, protected social security, and health care reform in exchange for votes as well as engage in transformational rhetoric to motivate followers for a new vision. Transformational leadership augments the effects of transactional leadership (Bass, 1990).

One style often dominates despite combined transformational and transactional leadership style opportunities. Wendt and Fairhurst (1994) conducted research on the rhetoric of leadership in the 1992 presidential election. They argued that George Bush was quickly identified as a transactional leader rather than one concerned with real change. Bill Clinton showed much more promise as a transformational leader, accomplishing "the basics of transformational leadership outlined by Bass (1985); he had a vision that inspired, was intellectually stimulating, and provided consideration for the individual by appearing to reach out to the individual voter" (p. 188). They argued, however, that Clinton had difficulty creating a "*working* vision" [emphasis original] because of his lack of Washington experience (p. 190). Obama similarly lacked significant Washington experience with limited senatorial experience.

Executive power does pose unique challenges for those trying to be visionary yet create stability, both goals of transformational leaders. Incumbent presidents, for example, would have a more difficult time arguing for a vision if they have not managed change during their previous term (Wendt & Fairhurst, 1994). In the 2008 election, however, both Republican and Democratic candidates were challengers to the position providing both candidates a unique stance for bringing change to the office of president. However, a vision for change must also create a sense of stability; a difficult promise in a declining economy. Challeng-

ers still would have to contend with any critiques of the jobs they did in the offices they held prior to their presidential bid, but the fact that neither candidate in the 2008 election had held the highest office limited incumbent attacks, although Obama tried to frame McCain as a surrogate incumbent (Benoit & Glantz, 2012).

The difficulty navigating partisan politics means U.S. presidents must rely on public support more than institutional support in passing decisions (Burns, 1978). FDR was particularly apt at sympathetic listening, and thus, exhibited individualized consideration. He was more persuasive because he was able to speak to individual concerns rather than collective doubt. However, some leaders might actually be pseudotransformational, appearing transformational but lacking certain characteristics, particularly individualized consideration, which serves to address impeded visions (Bass & Steidlemeir, 1998; Wendt & Fairhurst, 1994). Wendt and Fairhurst (1994) note charisma is difficult to sustain once in office particularly because "the constraints imposed by what political leaders do will . . . affect how they use the instruments of change to accomplish their goals" (p. 185). Clearly, anyone would face challenges maintaining the characteristics of transformational leadership, so while a candidate might claim to be transformational, the realities of the job might interfere with the candidate's vision. Rather than viewing transformational leadership claims in a vacuum, functional theory can be utilized to analyze leadership claims in relation to acclaims, attacks, and defenses.

Functional Theory

Developed by Benoit (Benoit, 2007; Benoit, Blaney, & Pier, 2007) the functional theory of political campaign discourse acknowledges the instrumental purpose of campaign rhetoric, namely to win the election. It is used to analyze messages politicians use to accomplish their goal of being elected. To that end, functional theory serves its purpose. However, the potential exists for functional theory to be combined with other theories or concepts to suggest the reasoning behind a candidate winning the majority vote, such as a candidate purporting to be a transformational leader. As such, functional theory can help scholars reveal the subtext of the campaign beyond the stated goals of campaign rhetoric. Further, functional theory might also get to the management of meaning not traditionally found in transformational leadership models (Wendt & Fairhurst, 1994).

Functional theory acknowledges that voters are asked to choose between candidates, comparing their rhetoric and determining who is best for the job (Benoit, 2007). Because of this comparative act, candidates must distinguish themselves from their opponent. Although candidates do not differ on every point, they choose platforms that distinguish their skills from those of their opponent. Candidates must demonstrate their leadership ability and superiority through their campaign messages, differentiating themselves in a way that voters favor. This is done through acclaiming, attacking, and defending. In other words, a candidate might self-praise using acclaims, showing how the candidate is better and more advantageous than the other candidate. Candidates might also use attacks or criticize their opponent, casting the opponent in an unfavorable

light. In particular, it is common to attack an opponent's leadership ability, portraying the opponent as incompetent in contrast to the candidate's acclaimed leadership prowess. Lastly, candidates might need to offer a defense against attacks from their opponent or refute the negative claims of their opponent. Candidates tend to use acclaims more than attacks and defenses, and attacks more than defenses (Benoit, 2007).

The discourse of candidates centers on policy and character issues, with policy comments outweighing character issues in most cases. General goals, past deeds, and future plans are three sub-forms of policy identified by Benoit (2001), while personal qualities, leadership ability, and ideals are identified as sub-forms of character. General goals are used more often to acclaim and state the position of the candidate. Ideals, which are characteristically similar to goals, are used more to acclaim. General goals are used more often than future plans, which makes sense because goals are more easily identified and defended than specific proposals or plans (Benoit, 2007). It is the sub-form of leadership quality that can be expanded to address the specific transformational leadership factors: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration (Bass & Avolio, 1990).

Benoit and colleagues have used functional theory to analyze campaign messages including acceptance addresses, presidential debates, and media influence (see, e.g., Benoit, 1999; Benoit & Brazeal, 2002; Benoit & Glantz, 2012; Benoit & Harthcock, 1999; Benoit & Rill, 2012; Benoit, Wells, Pier, & Blaney, 1999). Benoit's research has shown that the state of the economy influences candidate messages, which is important considering that the winning administration inherited the worst economic recession in 16 years (Benoit, McHale, Hansen, Pier, & McGuire, 2003). Benoit (2007) proposed that policy preferences, character perceptions, and ideology (political party) "work together to influence the voters' image or overall impression of the candidate" which ultimately influences the vote (p. 219). Taken together, these might also trigger perceptions of leadership style, specifically identifying a candidate as a transformational leader.

Of specific interest to this research, Benoit and Glantz (2012) conducted a functional analysis of the 2008 general election presidential television ads. Obama attacked in 68% of the analyzed utterances and acclaimed in 32% with defenses comprising less than 1% of utterances. Leadership ability was discussed in 17% of Obama's character utterances but was the least discussed factor in both character and policy utterances. This adds additional support for analyzing acceptance speeches where leadership ability could become a higher priority for discussion. Using functional theory and transformational leadership, Obama's campaign and presidency are analyzed to identify the promise and challenge of presidential leadership. Although Benoit and Glantz (2012) found that attacks outweighed acclaims in the 2008 presidential campaign ads, previous studies on presidential rhetoric have found acclaims to outweigh attacks. Because the acceptance speech is more about celebrating the party's nomination, we expect that:

H1: Acclaims will outnumber attacks, which will outnumber defenses.

Because transformational leadership is an adaptation to functional theory, there is no clear foundation for assuming that the use of one factor of transformational leadership will be any greater than another. Thus, exploration is necessary.

> RQ1: In what ways does Obama use acclaims and attacks of transformational leadership during the 2008 Democratic presidential nomination acceptance speech?
>
> RQ2: How have acclaims of transformational leadership during the 2008 Democratic presidential nomination acceptance speech translated to actions in the White House?

Focusing on transformational differences might allow us to speculate on the role of transformational leadership rhetoric in epideictic presidential convention speeches and implications for the presidency itself.

Method

Using functional theory, content analysis was employed to analyze the transcript of the 2008 nomination acceptance speech from Democratic nominee for president, Barack Obama. Functional theory (Benoit, 2007) has been employed for studying several forms of political discourse including convention acceptance addresses (Benoit et al., 1997), and keynote addresses (Benoit et al., 2000). Additional evidentiary support is provided to argue the difficulty of proclaimed transformational leadership while campaigning colliding with political realities necessitating transactional leadership abilities through an analysis of Obama's promises highlighted in the acceptance speech.

Artifact

Barack Obama delivered his acceptance speech at the Democratic National Convention in Denver, Colorado, on August 28, 2008. The convention speech was given at Invesco Field (now Sports Authority Field) in Denver, CO. Sports Authority Field is home to the Denver Broncos, an NFL Franchise, and is an open stadium seating 71,125. A crowd of more than 84,000 was in attendance. Obama argued for needed change from eight years of George W. Bush, promised to end our dependence on oil from the Middle East within 10 years, reduce taxes for 95% of Americans, remove our troops from Iraq, and attacked McCain for his voting record.

The 2008 election produced a record numbers of viewers and four of the most watched convention speeches in history. Presidential candidate Obama drew over 38.3 million viewers while McCain broke the record with over 40 million viewers (Rutenberg & Stelter, 2008; Silva, 2008).

Coding Procedures

Using Functional Theory as a content analysis technique involves three steps (Benoit, 2007). The first step is to unitize the transcripts into themes or

utterances that addressed a coherent functional or transformational leadership theme. Each theme can "extend from one phrase to an entire paragraph" (Benoit & Henson, 2007, p. 41; see also Holsti, 1969; O'Keefe, 1977). Berelson (1952) defined a theme as "an assertion about a subject" (p. 18). Similarly, Holsti (1969) stipulated that a theme is "a single assertion about some subject" (p. 116). Because discourse is inherently enthymematic, themes can vary in length from a phrase to several sentences. Whereas the majority of themes or utterances fit neatly into one of the three categories, those that did not fit into one of the three categories were not coded.

After the text was unitized, themes were classified based on the following definitions: Acclaim, Attack, or Defense (Benoit, 2007). The first level of coding acclaim, attack, or defense were coded as policy or leadership. The policies for acclaims and attacks were coded as past deeds, future plans, or general goals (Benoit, 2007). Leadership acclaims and attacks were coded as idealized influence, individualized consideration, inspirational motivation, or intellectual stimulation based on Bass and Avolio's (1990) dimensions of transformational leaders (see also Northouse, 2013) instead of Benoit's original character utterances traditionally coded as personal qualities, leadership ability, and ideals (see Benoit, 2007). In doing so, the content analysis focuses specifically on the dimensions of transformational leaders as identified by Bass and Avolio (1990).

Defenses were classified according to the categories of denial, evade responsibility, reduce offensiveness, corrective action, and mortification based on Benoit's forms of image repair discourse (Benoit, 1999). Defenses coded as denials were coded as simple denial or shifting blame (see appendix for illustrations of each form of an acclaim and attack).

The second author served as coder for the study and was responsible for creating the coding book. The primary author was trained with the codebook and instructions to clarify subsequent coding responsibilities. The primary author coded the first 20% of the Obama transcript in order to assess inter-coder reliability. Both coders reached 99.6% agreement for coding acclaims and 100% agreement when coding attacks. Further, Cohen's Kappa was calculated at .93 for acclaims and 1.0 for attacks. Since no defenses were coded, the category was removed from the analysis and inter-coder reliability was not calculated. Fleiss (1981) states, "values greater than .75 may be taken to represent excellent agreement beyond chance" (p. 218). Therefore, the figures in excess of .90 give us excellent inter-coder reliability in the coding of the transcript and may be taken to represent good agreement beyond chance.

To answer the second research question, the authors used secondary data from *Tampa Bay Times Politifact.com*, which evaluates whether President Obama was able to keep the campaign promises from his Democratic National Convention acceptance speech while in office over his first term. Although other databases of campaign promises exist, the site was chosen because of its credibility based on ownership, awards, and partnerships. Former owner Nelson Poynter bequeathed the paper to a nonprofit journalism school now called the Poynter Institute to preserve its independent status. Additionally, the Politfact.com portion of the *Tampa Bay Times* recently won a Pulitzer Prize. Its on-

going partnerships with a variety of news sources, including publicly funded NPR, further demonstrates the site's integrity (Holan, 2012).

Promises were defined by Politifact.com as measurable: "We said a promise 'is not a position statement. It is a prospective statement of an action or outcome that is verifiable'" ("How," n.d.). A list of promises were created by poring "through speech transcripts, TV appearances, position papers and campaign Web sites," noting all sources with each promise; however, this research only focused on the promises from the acceptance speech for reasons of research design and validity. Promises were tracked by *Politifact.com* and evaluated according to whether each promise was (a) kept; (b) compromised; (c) broken; (d) stalled; (e) in the works; or, (f) not yet rated.

In order to evaluate the promises made in the nomination acceptance speech, the authors went through Obama's speech and identified all policy promises and then compared our list to one compiled by *CNN* ("Obama," 2008). The completed list contained 42 broad-based promises. We then searched the Politifact database twice to identify promises related to those made in the nomination speech. Promises in the acceptance speech were broad so selection of specific promises in Politifact were somewhat subjective, but every effort was made to make sure that the promises were classified to match the intent of the promise in the acceptance speech. A total of 135 specific promises were identified by both authors as matching the intent of the promises in the acceptance speech. The authors then reviewed the promises to determine whether they have been classified as kept, broken, compromised, stalled, in the works, or not yet rated. Of those identified, only one was still in the works and none were classified as stalled or not yet rated. Appendix B contains the promise categories, a sample of specific promises for each category, and the Politifact ratings in each category. The secondary data provided additional evidentiary support for the second research question and provides this study with a longitudinal aspect in order to evaluate the ability to remain a transformational leader once in office.

Results

The results are grouped by topic and discussed in order. The hypothesis predicted that acclaims would outnumber attacks. Obama used almost three times more acclaims (72%) than attacks (28%; see Table 1). However, no defenses were used. This finding is consistent with past research by Benoit (1999; 2007) on candidate acceptance speeches and campaign advertisements (Benoit & Rill, 2012). A *chi-square goodness of fit test* revealed the frequency of acclaims, $n = 178$ (72%), was significantly greater than attacks, $n = 70$ (28%), $\chi^2(1, N = 248) = 47.03$, $p < .001$. This supports hypothesis one, which predicted that acclaims would outnumber attacks, which would outnumber defenses.

Table 1
Function of Obama's Presidential Nomination Speech

Acclaim	178 (72%)
Attack	70 (28%)

Total	248

Note. $\chi^2(1, N=248) = 47.03$, $p < .001$.

Obama relied on acclaiming his future plans (40%) and general goals (49%) far more than past deeds (11%). With regard to attacks, Obama attacked both McCain and Palin on past deeds (66%) more than their future plans (14%) and general goals (20%).

The first research question asked how acclaims and attacks were used in terms of transformational leadership. Obama focused on acclaiming idealized influence (62%) or motivating voters to embrace change and believe in hope for the future. Obama's speech embodied the other three factors fairly equally: individualized consideration (13%), inspirational motivation (13%), and intellectual stimulation (12%; see Table 2). There was a significant difference in the leadership factors identified, $\chi^2(3, N = 106) = 74.60$, $p < .001$, with idealized influence far outweighing the other three factors. Nearly 60% of the 178 acclaims in the acceptance speech are leadership acclaims, while all character claims comprised only 38% of Obama's campaign ads (Benoit & Glantz, 2012). It is clear that Obama's intention was to magnify his leadership ability through his acceptance speech, most notably identifying himself as a charismatic leader (idealized influence). Because of the presence of each of the other three factors, it is possible that the audience would view Obama as a transformational leader.

With regard to attacks, there was no significant difference in the identified leadership factors, $\chi^2(3, N = 35) = 3.06$, $p > .05$. Obama attacked the overall leadership ability of the Republican ticket (McCain and Palin) as much as he attacked their future policies. Further, Obama's attack on each leadership factor was rather evenly distributed: individualized consideration (34%), intellectual stimulation (29%), idealized influence (23%), and inspirational motivation (14%). Obama focused heavily on acclaiming his leadership, but considering there were only 70 utterances of attack, it can be argued that he also heavily discounted the leadership of the Republican ticket to make sure he stood out as the more capable and transformational leader.

Table 2
Forms of Policy and Leadership Acclaims

Acclaims	
Policy	
Past Deeds	8 (11%)
Future Plans	29 (40%)
General Goals	35 (49%)
Leadership	
Idealized Influence	65 (62%)
Individualized Consideration	14 (13%)
Inspirational Motivation	14 (13%)
Intellectual Stimulation	13 (12%)

Note. $\chi^2(3, N=106) = 74.60$, $p < .001$.

To answer the second research question on how acclaims of transformational leadership during the 2008 Democratic presidential nomination convention translated to the White House, promises made in the acceptance speech were identified and secondary data from Politifact on the success of the promises were used (see Table 4). A *chi-square goodness of fit test* revealed a significant distribution, $\chi^2(2, N = 135) = 23.7$, $p < .001$. Obama and his administration have kept 71 of 135 promises (52.5%), with 35 broken (25.9%) and 28 compromised (20.7%). Implications for these results are discussed below.

Table 3
Forms of Policy and Leadership Attacks

Attacks	
Policy	
Past Deeds	23 (66%)
Future Plans	5 (14%)
General Goals	7 (20%)
Leadership	
Idealized Influence	8 (23%)
Individualized Consideration	12 (34%)
Inspirational Motivation	5 (14%)
Intellectual Stimulation	10 (29%)

Note. $\chi^2(3, N = 106) = 74.60$, $p < .001$.

Table 4
Progress of Obama's Acceptance Speech Promises

Kept	71 (52.5%)
Compromise	28 (20.7%)
Broken	35 (25.9%)
In the Works	1 (<1%)
Total	135

Note. $\chi^2(2, N = 135) = 23.7, p < .001$

Discussion

Despite the rising expectation that candidates at least appear transformational (Wendt & Fairhurst, 1994), very little has been done to assess presidential transformational leadership. Functional theory is useful for identifying the rhetoric attempting to influence voter preference, but this study has shown that it also can be adapted to identify the type of leadership asserted by a political candidate. Analyzing Obama's acceptance speech allowed us to focus on leadership claims not likely developed in other campaign messages, particularly since the 2008 election had the most negative televised advertisements in history (Benoit & Glantz, 2012).

Functional theory was first used to assess the acclaims, attacks, and defenses in Obama's acceptance address. The hypothesis was supported with acclaims outweighing attacks, with both outweighing defenses, as there were none. For the purposes of this study, not having defenses to code potentially limits any conclusions about combining this element of functional theory with the transformational leadership model. Acceptance speeches are meant to be celebratory of a candidate's nomination, so it is not surprising that acclaims would outnumber other rhetorical strategies. Candidates can focus on more positive aspects of their campaigns, including acclaims of leadership potential.

Obama acclaimed his ability to lead the U.S. stating, "I believe that, as hard as it will be, the change we need is coming" (Obama, 2008). He acclaimed his ability to be a transformational leader by becoming the very embodiment of racial change in the White House. Although there were few allusions to race in Obama's nomination acceptance speech, Obama had created a foundation to discursively address race through themes identified in key speeches, such as *A More Perfect Union* (Dilliplane, 2012). Thus, Obama sets a point of reference found in earlier speeches and relies on the American dream through the eyes of Martin Luther King, Jr.:

> And it is that promise that, 45 years ago today, brought Americans from every corner of this land to stand together on a Mall in Washington, before Lincoln's Memorial, and hear a young preacher from Georgia speak of his dream. . . .America, we cannot turn back, not with so much work to be done; not with so many children to educate, and so many veterans to care

> for; not with an economy to fix, and cities to rebuild, and farms to save; not with so many families to protect and so many lives to mend. (Obama, 2008)

Obama acclaims his vision for restoring the American dream by promising to resolve issues largely perceived as ignored by the Bush administration.

Because Obama claimed to have a working vision for making a difference in Washington D.C. if elected, we also asked whether there were any observed differences in Obama's rhetoric with regard to acclaims of transformational leadership and attacks of the transformational leadership potential of McCain and Palin. Obama acclaimed more of his future plans and general goals while acclaiming his character demonstrating all four transformational leadership elements, with idealized influence heavily outweighing the other three. A candidate who lacks individualized concern could potentially be a pseudotransformational leader (Bass & Steidlemeir, 1998), but this trait was identified in Obama's speech in equal measure to inspirational motivation and intellectual stimulation. Although this is not the only measure of a pseudotransformational leader, the presence of individualized concern demonstrates at least some sincerity on Obama's part.

Although Obama clearly acclaimed his leadership in ways that appear transformational, evaluating his efforts following the election can indicate whether it is possible for presidents to be truly transformational given the competitive nature and polarization of a two-party system. Obama has consistently met with resistance for most of his campaigning visions, including closing Guantanamo Bay, health care reform (Harris & VandeHei, 2010), and alternative energy efforts. In fact, closing Guantanamo was categorized as a promise broken, health care reform is largely a promise kept, and alternative energy efforts have seen mixed results. As Wendt and Fairhurst (1994) acknowledge, it is possible to be transformational enough to get votes, but that might not be enough to get things accomplished on Capitol Hill. Clinton was similarly viewed as transformational in his campaign but lacking such leadership in at least the early part of his presidency (Wendt & Fairhurst, 1994). Leadership should be viewed as an ongoing process (Avolio & Gibbons, 1988) so a longitudinal look at presidential efforts might better inform on the elected person's leadership style.

Additionally, the role of race in the oval office is just now being played out, so a longitudinal view of Obama's campaigns and presidency could further highlight racial discourse in the presidency. Some scholars have noted disappointment in the lack of continued discussions of race or articulated policies in the first term of the Obama administration (McPhail & McPhail, 2011). Realistically, the discourse on the effects of race in this presidency will continue beyond Obama's presidency with both his domestic and foreign interactions filtered through race discourse by those who analyze and critique his leadership style as a standing president. It is possible that focusing on pressing policy issues (transactional) derails constructive racial discourse (transformation) once in office (McPhail & McPhail, 2012).

As research has noted, the presidency does require transactional leadership to get things accomplished (Bass, 1985), but whether it interferes with the ability

to truly be transformational is still unclear. The secondary data reveal that more than half of the promises outlined in the acceptance speech have been kept, but overall numbers are less optimistic with only a third of all promises kept. Even with broken promises, it would be unfair to suggest that Obama did not faithfully work to keep those promises. Politifact even notes that a broken promise rating does not mean Obama failed to advocate for his promises, but rather offers possible evidence of other elements of the political system at work such as opposition in Congress or the impact of public opinion ("How," n.d.). In many of the broad promise goals outlined in the acceptance speech, Obama experienced a mix of success, compromise, and failure in keeping promises. There are some promises, however, that did seem to get little attention. For example, the promise to close the gender wage gap has as its only specific promise to implement a women owned business contracting program. Although it might appear that Obama has kept his promise in this area, one action is hardly enough to change discriminatory wage practices.

It should be noted that Obama has taken on controversial issues that might be characteristic of a transformational leader. The repeal of "Don't Ask Don't Tell" was a promise kept and social coup, yet other promises with the intention of ensuring "gays and lesbians have the right to live free of discrimination" remain as promises broken at this time. Nonetheless, Obama has continued to argue for anti-discrimination laws, marriage equality, and adoption equality for gay males and lesbians despite the fact they are divisive issues. It also should be considered that presidents potentially become emboldened by second terms: tackling issues they might not have risked in their first terms. We could see Obama re-address promises that met with derision in his first term.

Additionally, future research might consider the impact of variables such as Congress, checks and balances, and public opinion. There were several notations within the commentary on the promises to indicate efforts made by Obama, such as "Obama has made a good faith effort" (Farley, 2011, "Not enough"); "the current climate makes it difficult for the president to fulfill the letter of his promise" (Jacobson, 2011, "Funding"); and, as Christine Lubinski, vice president for global health at the Infectious Diseases Society of America and HIV Medicine Association, noted: "It's not really fair to hold the president accountable in a rigid way. The floor fell out with the economy" (Wogan, 2012, "Spending"). These comments suggest that there are several variables that impact the ability of a leader, particularly a president, to be transformational.

There are other potential pitfalls when a speaker relies heavily on charisma (idealized influence) rather than other factors. Obama relied on charisma nearly 4.5 times more than any other factor. Obama's difficulty getting his vision through a bi-partisan Congress may have quite a bit to do with focusing more on idealized influence and less on individual consideration, intellectual stimulation, and motivational inspiration. Additional research on whether these factors are more prevalent in speeches to Congress and to the public could be revealing. A president's leadership is meant for leading the American citizens, not necessarily lawmakers, so it could be unfair to attribute falseness to Obama's intent when up against those who are trying to lead in their own right, often dogmatically

determined to foster their own vision in opposition to that of the president. Additionally, leaders can be transformational and transactional at the same time (Bass, 1985), and although this study did not focus on transactional leadership, it might be that a combination is needed to move transformational visions forward. Bipartisanship might call for more hands on management of ideas and personalities than expected of transformational leaders.

To that end, there is a cautionary tale in our system whereby presidents are consistently protecting themselves and their interests. In the last year and a half of Obama's first presidential term, unemployment has hovered around 9.2% (DOL, 2011) and the debt ceiling was raised to prevent defaulting on loans (Sahadi, 2011). If, in the end, a transformational leader does not really have the capacity to make the visionary changes promised, is it more of a collision than a collaboration of leadership strategies? Such concerns should not be taken lightly as voters consider whether politicians can talk a great vision, but become crippled under bureaucracy.

Conclusion

Although functional theory stands on its own in analyzing political rhetoric, there can be a benefit to leadership studies to combine functional theory with leadership models, in this case, the model of transformational leadership. Political candidates are naturally going to acclaim their leadership potential, but the type of leadership espoused can provide additional insight into a candidate's rhetoric and intentions once reaching the White House. Unfortunately, what is espoused is not always what transpires after inauguration. The ability to influence and motivate could be stifled by partisan stances and, for the first time in U.S. history, challenged by racial differences.

Although we only looked at the one speech, our main purpose was to test the usefulness of combining functional theory and the transformational leadership model. There were not any defenses to note in the speech analyzed, limiting any conclusions about how defenses might be combined with transformational leadership claims. However, through this analysis it is clear that identifying factors of transformational leadership can help in discerning the type of leadership proclaimed. The awareness that transformational acclaims do not always transfer into White House action could provide a moment of pause for voters as they attempt to divide charisma from other important factors of motivation, listening, and innovation. A lack of leadership skill could result in a difficult presidency, causing the citizenry to suffer the consequences.

More research needs to be done to test the combined use of functional theory and the transformational leadership model or other potential extensions of the theory. Additionally, focusing on audiences such as Congress and the public would be useful to determine whether a candidate is viewed as being a transactional, transformational, or even pseudotransformational leader. Comparing candidates over time could also be useful in determining the value of transformational leadership characteristics in political office. It is clear that Obama has been able to inspire followers, but being transformational means providing a clear vision that can be acted upon. Less than half of his overall promises have

been fully realized, which could indicate lacking abilities necessary of transformational leaders. However, studying the differences in how presidents tackle issues in their first term versus their second could provide additional insight. Researching a wider variety of rhetoric using this combined method might also prove fruitful in identifying the consistency of the presence or absence of transformational leadership factors.

If it is difficult to carry transformational leadership into the White House, the role of transformational leadership rhetoric in epideictic presidential convention speeches comes into question. By adding elements of the transformational leadership model to the character analysis in functional theory, we were able to go beyond simple claims of leadership and look at more specific characteristics of leadership; namely those that might identify a leader as specifically transformational, developing individual concern, intellectual stimulation, and inspirational motivation along with the charisma that likely got the candidate elected. It is clear from the analysis that Obama appeared as a strong transformational leader, which undoubtedly aided his election. However, Obama seems to be following a similar trajectory as Clinton. Wendt and Fairhurst (1994) noted of Clinton:

> A true transformational leader realizes the interrelationship between meaning and action, and will present a *working* vision—a plan which is easily understood, realistic, and manageable in the sense that it can be packaged, sold, and acted upon. With little Washington experience, however, Clinton could not formulate a working vision, one that could realize the promise of transformational leadership. (p. 190)

Obama's lack of insider knowledge became apparent once he took office, which hampered his ability to create change. Despite campaign promises, Obama discovered that closing Guantanamo Bay was not as easy as he thought it would be (Hounshell, 2011) and that there are no "shovel-ready projects" (Condon, 2010) to quickly stimulate the economy. Transformational leadership rhetoric might facilitate getting a candidate into the White House, but it does not unify a divided house.

References

Aldoory, L., & Toth, E. (2004). Leadership and gender in public relations: Perceived effectiveness of transformational and transactional leadership styles. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 16*(2), 157-183. doi:10.1207/s1532754xjprr1602_2

Avolio, B. J. (2005). *Leadership development in balance: Made/born.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Avolio, B. J., & Gibbons, T. C. (1988). *Developing transformational leaders: A life span approach.* In J. A. Conger and R. N. Kanungo (Eds.), pp. 276-308. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Barbuto, J. E., Jr., & Burbach, M. E. M. (2006). The emotional intelligence of transformational leaders: A field study of elected officials. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 146*(1), 51-64. doi:10.3200/SOCP.146.1.51-64

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations.* New York: Free Press.

Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership.* New York: Free Press.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1990). The implications of transactional and transformational leadership for individual, team, and organizational development. *Research in Organizational Change and Development, 4,* 231-272.

Bass, B. M., & Steidlmeier, P. (1998). *Ethics, character, and authentic transformational leadership.* Retrieved from http://cls.binghamton.edu/BassSteid.html [No longer active]. doi:10.1016/S1048-9843(99)00016-8

Bennis, W. (1984). The 4 competencies of leadership. *Training and Development Journal, 38*(8), 14-19.

Benoit, W. L. (1999). *Seeing spots: A functional analysis of presidential television advertisements from 1952-1996*. New York: Praeger.

Benoit, W. L. (2007). *Communication in political campaigns*. New York: Peter Lang.

Benoit, W. L., & Brazeal, L. M. (2002). A functional analysis of the 1998 Bush-Dukakis presidential debates. *Argumentation and Advocacy, 38*(4), 219-233.

Benoit, W. L., & Glantz, M. (2012). A functional analysis of 2008 General Election Presidential TV spots. *Speaker & Gavel, 49*(1), 1-19.

Benoit, W. L., & Harthcock, A. (1999). Functions of the great debates: Acclaims, attacks, and defenses in the 1960 presidential debates. *Communication Monographs, 66*(4), 341-357. doi:10.1080/03637759909376484

Benoit, W. L., & Henson, J. R. (2007). A functional analysis of the 2006 Canadian and 2007 Australian election debates. *Argumentation and Advocacy, 44*, 36-48.

Benoit, W. L., & Rill, L. A. (2012). A functional analysis of 2008 presidential primary TV spots. *Speaker & Gavel, 49*(1), 55-67.

Benoit, W. L., Blaney, J. R., & Pier, P. M. (1998). *Campaign '96: A functional analysis of acclaiming, attacking, and defending.* New York: Praeger.

Benoit, W. L., McHale, J. P., Hansen, G. J., Pier, P. M., & McGuire, J. P. (2003*). Campaign 2000: A functional analysis of presidential campaign discourse*. Lanham, MD: Rowan & Littlefield.

Benoit, W. L., Wells, W. T., Pier P. M., & Blaney, J. R. (1999). Acclaiming, attacking, and defending in nomination convention acceptance addresses, 1960-1996. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 85(3),* 247-267. doi:10.1080/00335639909384260

Berelson, B. (1952). *Content analysis for the social sciences and humanities*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Bolkan, S., & Goodboy, A. K., (2011). Behavioral indicators of transformational leadership in the college classroom. *Qualitative Research Reports, 12*(1), 10-18. doi: 10.1080/17459435.2011.601520

Brown, C. B. (2011). Barack Obama as the great man: Communicative constructions of racial transcendence in white-male elite discourses. *Communication Monographs, 78*(4), 535-556. doi: 10.1080/03637751.2011.618140

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership.* New York: Harper & Row.

Condon, S. (2010, Oct. 13). Obama: "No such thing as shovel-ready projects." *CBSNews.com*. Retrieved from http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-503544_162-20019468-503544.html

Daughton, S. M. (1994). Women's issues, women's place: Gender-related problems in presidential campaigns. *Communication Quarterly, 42*(2), 106-119. doi: 10.1080/01463379409369920

Dilliplane, S. (2012). Race, rhetoric, and running for president: Unpacking the significance of Barack Obama's "A More Perfect Union" speech. *Rhetoric & Public Affairs, 15*, 127-152.

Fleiss, J. L. (1981). Statistical methods for ratios and proportions. New York: Wiley.

Harris, J. F., & VandeHei, J. (2010, July 15). Why Obama loses by winning. *Politico*. Retrieved from http://dyn.politico.com/printstory.cfm?uuid=D58D428A-18FE-70B2-A80D4E80D221BD8A

Holan, A. G. (2012, Jan. 9). Who is PolitiFact? Who pays for PolitiFact? *Politifact.com*. Retrieved from http://www.politifact.com/truth-o-meter/blog/2011/oct/06/who-pays-for-politifact/

Holsti, O. (1969). *Content analysis in communication research*. New York: Free Press.

Houck, D. W. (1997). Reading the body in the text: FDR's 1932 speech to the democratic national convention. *Southern Communication Journal, 63*(1), 20-36. doi: 10.1080/10417949709373075

Hounshell, B. (2011, Mar. 11). Obama is facing reality on Gitmo. CNN.com. Retrieved from http://www.cnn.com/2011/OPINION/03/11/hounshell.guantanamo.obama/index.html?iref=allsearch

House, R. J., Spangler, W. D., & Woycke, J. (1991). Personality and charisma in the U.S. presidency: A psychological theory of leader effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 36*(3), 364-396. doi:10.2307/2393201

How the promise meters work. (n.d.). *About Politifact.com*. Retrieved from http://www.poltifact.com/about/

Howell, B. W. (2011). Change and continuity in concession and victory speeches: Race, gender, and age in the closing statements of the 2008 presidential campaign. *American Behavioral Scientist, 55*(6), 765-783. doi: 10.1177/0002764211406082

Jacobson, L. (2011, Sept. 30). Funding for manufacturing program is up, but not double. *Politifact.com*. Retrieved from http://www.politifact.com/truth-o-

meter/promises/obameter/promise/7/double-funding-for-the-manufacturing-extension-par/

Jiang, H. (2012). A model of work-life conflict and quality of employee-organization relationships (EORs): Transformational leadership, procedural justice, and family-supportive workplace initiatives. *Public Relations Review, 38*(2), 231-245. doi: 10.106/j.pubrev.2011.11.007

McPhail, M. L., & McPhail, R. (2011). (E)raced men: Complicity and responsibility in the rhetorics of Barack Obama. *Rhetoric & Public Affairs, 14*(4), 673-692.

Northouse, P. G. (2013). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (6th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

O'Keefe, D. J. (1977). Two concepts of argument. *Journal of the American Forensic Association, 13*(3), 121-128.

Obama spells out plans for change. (2008, Aug. 29). *CNN.Politics*. Retrieved from http://articles.cnn.com/2008-08-29/politics/obama.promises_1_fuel-efficient-cars-health-care-tax-code?_s=PM:POLITICS

Obama, B. (2008, August 28). Democratic National Convention presidential nomination acceptance. Presented at INVESCO Field at Mile High Stadium, Denver, CO. Retrieved from http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/convention2008/barackobama2008dnc.htm

Östman, Z. (2012). *Strict Father Bush and Nurturant Parent Obama: An Ideology Analysis of Presidential Acceptance Speeches, Portraying Conservative and Liberal Metaphors in the Nation-as-Family Theory* (Doctoral dissertation, Södertörn University).

Petrocik, J. R., Benoit, W. L., & Hansen, G. L. (2003-2004). Issue ownership and presidential campaigning, 1952-2000. *Political Science Quarterly, 118*(4), 599-626. Retrieved from www.jstor.org/stable/30035698

Rutenberg, J., & Stelter, B. (2008, March 6). Conventions, Anything but Dull, Are a TV Hit. *The New York Times.* Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2008/09/06/us/politics/06ratings.html?ref_politics

Sahadi, J. (2011, Aug. 1). CBO: Debt ceiling deal cuts at least $2.1 trillion. *CNNMoney*. Retrieved from http://money.cnn.com/2011/08/01/news/economy/debt_ceiling_deal_cbo/index.htm

Scheele, H. Z. (1984). Ronald Reagan's 1980 acceptance address: A focus on American values. *Western Journal of Speech Communication, 48*(1), 51-61. doi: 10.1080/10570318409374141

Silva, M. (2008, Speteber 18). TV Convention-Viewers: most Americans. Retrieved from http://www.swamppolitics.com/news/politics/blog/2008/09/tv_conventionviewers_most_amer.html

Weber, M. (Henderson, A. M, & Parsons, T. (trans). (1947). *The theory of social and economic organization.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Wells, W. T. (1999). *An analysis of attacking, acclaiming, and defending strategies in the 1976-1984 presidential debates.* Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Missouri, Columbia.

Wendt, R. F., & Fairhurst, G. T. (1994). Looking for 'the vision thing:' The rhetoric of leadership in the 1992 presidential election. *Communication Quarterly*, *42*(2), 180-195.

Wogan, J. B. (2012, July 30). Spending is less than promised, but more people receive medical treatment and care. *Politifact.com*. Retrieved from http://www.politifact.com/truth-o-meter/promises/obameter/promise/83/provide-50-billion-by-2013-for-the-global-fight-a/

Appendix A

Example of

Acclaim

- Policy
  - Past deeds: Because I've seen it in Illinois, when we provided health care to more children and moved more families from welfare to work.
  - Future plans: As President, I will tap our natural gas reserves.
  - General goals: Now is the time to end this addiction and to understand that drilling is a stop-gap measure, not a long term solution, no even close.
- Character (Leadership)
  - Idealized Influence: We are more compassionate that a government that lets veterans sleep on our streets.
  - Individualized Consideration (Personal qualities): She's the one that taught me about hard work.
  - Inspirational Motivation: I believe that, as hard as it will be, the change we need is coming.
  - Intellectual Stimulation: in 10 years, we will finally end our dependence on oil from the middle ease. We will do this.

Attack

- Policy
  - Past deeds: But the record's clear: John McCain has voted with George Bush ninety percent of the time.
  - Future plans: We may not agree on abortion, but surely we can agree on reducing the number of unwanted pregnancies in this country.
  - General goals: Don't tell me we can't uphold the Second Amendment while keeping AK-47s out of the hands of criminals.

- Character (Leadership)
  - Idealized Influence: Tell the military families who shoulder their burden silently as they watch their loved ones leave for their third or fourth or fifth tour of duty.
  - Individualized Consideration (Personal qualities): Now, I don't believe that Senator McCain doesn't care what's going on in the lives of Americans. I just think he doesn't know.
  - Inspirational Motivation: If you don't have a record to run on, they you paint your opponent as someone people should run from. You make a big election about small things.
  - Intellectual Stimulation: How else could be propose hundreds of millions in tax breaks for big corporations and oil companies but not one penny of tax relief to more that one hundred million Americans?

Appendix B

Acceptance Speech Promises	Sample of Corresponding Promises	Total	Kept	Comp	Broken	In Works
Tax Promises	No family making less than $250,000 will see "any form of tax increase."	11	4	3	4	0
Energy Promises	Reduce dependence on foreign oil	18	12	2	3	1
Education Promises	Invest $10 billion per year in early intervention educational and developmental programs	14	8	4	2	0
Health Care Promises	Sign a "universal" health care bill	16	11	3	2	0
Labor Law Promises	Provide a $1.5 billion fund to help states launch programs for paid family and medical leave	5	1	0	4	0
Corporate Reform Promises	Close loopholes in the corporate tax deductibility of CEO pay	3	1	0	2	0
Federal Spending	Go "line by line" over earmarks to make sure money	1	0	1	0	0

	being spent wisely					
National Defense	•Direct military leaders to end war in Iraq •Fully fund the Veterans Administration	25	16	6	3	0
Foreign Relations	Work with Russia to move nuclear weapons off hair-trigger alert	34	16	7	11	0
Other	•Expand the Employment Non-Discrimination Act to include sexual orientation and gender identity •Repeal "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy •Provide a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants •Create a prison-to-work incentive program	8	2	2	4	0

Kristina Drumheller (Ph.D., University of Missouri-Columbia) West Texas A&M University, WTAMU Box 60754, Canyon, TX 79016, kdrumheller@wtamu.edu. Drumheller is a corresponding author on the manuscript.

Greg G. Armfield (Ph.D., University of Missouri-Columbia), New Mexico State University, MSC 3W, P.O. Box 30001, Las Cruces, NM 88003-8001, Armfield@NMSU.edu

How Coaches Maintain the Status Quo: An Application of Chaim Perelman's Values and Universal Audience to NPDA

Crystal Lane Swift

Abstract

Chaim Perelman is explored as a rhetorically significant figure, beginning with a bit of background, delving into his theory, and finishing with some of his critics. His theories are still applicable today. All in all, Perelman is primarily concerned with the relationship between argumentation and value judgments. Overall, coaches and debaters alike could benefit from revisiting Perelman. This paper serves as a starting point to the current meta-debate over values and audiences within intercollegiate NPDA, where the same issues regarding value judgments and the universal audience are still raised.

Introduction

There is tension in the world of National Parliamentary Debate Association (NPDA) debate today, regarding how students ought to be trained to debate. I maintain that no similar perspective (e.g., performance every round, only rhetorical kritiks matter, if a team does not address every stock issue they automatically lose, left or right is always best, etc.) on debate is the most helpful for building students' real-world argumentation skills. However, I clearly take a more traditional approach than some of my forensic colleagues. In any case, the most long-term useful skills that debaters can learn from NPDA are precision and audience adaptation. It is my argument that we are currently in a crisis in NPDA. Coaches are bickering and fighting with one another over which coaching and judging practices are hurting debaters the most. It is exactly this *bickering* which is hurting debaters the most.

Let me preface this position paper to those who may automatically categorize it as "complaint scholarship" and shut down before hearing me out. Interestingly, our community purports to be open-minded and progressive, and simultaneously, we have stringent behavioral expectations in the form of unwritten rules/norms. When scholars write out against these expectations, many are accused of "complaint scholarship" or being a "sore loser." This is a similar feel to forensic conferences and tournament meetings. It is these "complaints" that lead to changes in our community, many of these are changes for the better. For example, NPDA would never have been born if not for "complaints" or genuine concerns about the trajectory of Cross-Examination Debate Association (CEDA) and National Debate Tournament (NDT), at that time. More recently, the individual event-listserv has been overloaded with debate over the potential changes to interpretation of literature events which are all essentially rooted in "complaint" or observation about what is going wrong in those events.

In a time when many forensic programs are facing stagnant or shrinking budgets, in-fighting will only hurt us more. Hence, I argue, we must return to

our rhetorical roots, as well as to the nature of NPDA debate that emphasizes the *public* (which would include the diverse judges who exist in our community), to help us to prove ourselves to our departments, show the larger community that we are creating productive democratic citizens, and point the finger at *ourselves* for once, rather than at each other. Early justification for NPDA debate as described by Sheckels and Warfield (1990) included argumentskills, public speaking skills, oratorical skills, extemporaneous skills, exposure to a more global world, interaction with students from various institutions, and responsibility. However, as described by Cates and Eaves (2010), NPDA is now at the point CEDA was twenty years ago. Rather than creating yet another debate format, I argue we can save NPDA by making a return to our rhetorical roots.

Obviously, resolving this conflict is beyond the scope of one paper, one book, one person. Therefore, my immediate goal is to spur discussion (not bickering) regarding our pedagogy and take one baby step to re-grounding forensics in its rhetorical roots. I believe Perelman, who was interested in practical reasoning, is a good place to start. Consequently, I will explore Perelman's theory, apply his theory to contemporary argumentation, and draw impacts from this analysis.

The New Rhetoric

Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca co-authored a seminal work, *The New Rhetoric* (1969), to establish a different interpretation of how people can and should argue. As Perelman (1968) clarified, "Our view entails that all argumentation is rhetorical" (p.168). This rhetorical interpretation of argumentation grounds their view of logic. In their co-authored work, Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (1969) explained:

> The new rhetoric does not aim at displacing or replacing formal logic, but at adding to it a field of reasoning that, up to now, has escaped all efforts at rationalization, namely practical reasoning. Its domain is the study of critical thought, reasonable choice, and justified behavior. It applies whenever action is linked to rationality. (p. 40)

The theorists aimed primarily at adding a pragmatic dimension to an otherwise fairly esoteric formal logic. As Perelman (1968) explained regarding their theory:

> Anything that one characterizes as a fact is indissolubly bound up with its acceptance. I insist that we speak of fact, of objectivity, only as long as there exists an agreement to accord to the content of a proposition this status of recognized fact; if the status is put to question, the "fact" becomes a "theory," an "opinion," an "hypothesis," or even a simple "illusion." (p.170)

This is a shift from the removed, more theoretical realm to a theoretically informed, but pragmatic realm.

Essentially, Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca's *New Rhetoric* (1969) places argumentation using formal logic within a practical context. As the authors explained, "for argumentation to exist, an effective community of minds must be realized at a given moment" (p. 14). There must be an agreement within and about the community before there can be debate on a given issue. It is from this agreement on basic premises, which an arguer can begin discussing an issue, or as the theorists state, "*it is in terms of an audience that an argumentation develops*" (emphasis in original, Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, 1969, p. 5).

The concepts I am most interested in from Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca's *New Rhetoric* (1969) are the universal and particular audiences. "Everyone constitutes the universal audience from what he knows of his fellow men, in such a way as to transcend the few oppositions he is aware of. Each individual, each culture, has thus its own conception of the universal audience" (Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, 1969, p. 33). The universal audience is the audience that a speaker creates in his or her mind, and the particular audience is the actual audience present. These two audiences invoke different approaches, or, as put by Perelman (1968) "the attempt to convince as a particular kind of persuasion—a kind in which the persuasion addresses a universal audience" (p.169). The response to an audience is based on which the speaker is talking to.

These concepts, while distinctly definable, are not independent from one another. As explained by Constantinides (1999):

> By characterizing audience using the two interdependent constructs of the universal and the particular, Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca forge a powerful tool for analyzing audiences. By defining the universal audience with respect to social conditions, a speaker identifies values universally considered valid. Based on the social function and setting of the anticipated audience, the speaker can further clarify the viewpoint of that audience, one that instantiates a universal concept. Moreover, the dialectical relationship between the universal and particular resonates such that the speaker can tack between the abstract and the concrete, resorting to the first to justify a concept and the second to particularize that concept. (pp. 55-56)

Essentially, the universal audience will determine definitional material and general concepts that will be accepted or at least acceptable, while the particular audience will determine parameters for examples and support that will sway that audience.

Application of Perelman to Contemporary Argumentation

In the interest of transparency and spurring a continued conversation in this area, it is important for me to be upfront and explain that the connections I am making between Perelman and NPDA are presented through analysis and anecdotal or autoethnographic data. This is a position I am taking as the start to what I hope will become a longer, more in-depth discussion on the matter. Many great forensic scholars have written starting pieces using a similar approach, such as Snider's (1984) on ethics and game debating, German's (1985) on rhetorical

criticism methodology, Klope's (1986) on duo interpretation, and plenty of others (i.e., Adams & Cox, 1995; Aden, 1991; Epstein, 1992; Kuster, 2002; Swift, 2012; VerLinden, 1987; VerLinden, 1997). In other words, I am building an argument here, which can be accepted, rejected, tested, or simply ignored. What follows is an inductive analysis and application of the above theory to my own lived experience in NPDA debate.

Through an understanding of the universal and particular audiences, it is possible to apply this theory to contemporary argumentation and debate. From both experience and a read of the literature in this area, it is clear that contemporary intercollegiate parliamentary debaters and judges are quite diverse in ability and perspectives. However, because of the uniting factors of the community (i.e., the rules from NPDA, the agreement to participation in this community, etc.), the universal audience would be an excellent start for NPDA debate training. NPDA debate is community-oriented and public by comparison to other formats of academic debate (Johnson, 1994; Kuster, 2002; Preston, 2006; Swift, 2007a; Swift 2007b; Swift 2008; Swift In Press). A suggested way to keep this community and public nature is to incorporate judges from outside of debate (Kuster, Olson, & Loging, 2001). The use of judges from within the community ensures that NPDA's norms continue, the way that they do in individual events (Cronn-Mills & Golden, 1997; Maddex, 2005; Swift 2006). As put by Bartanen and Frank (1999):

> In the rhetorical tradition, students are expected to face diverse audiences, knowing as well that different audiences and individual audience members require different kinds of proof. Because audiences and audience members hold different values and use a variety of modes of inquiry, students were taught the art of adaptation. Students were expected to study sociological pluralism and the various logics at work in the world. (p. 43)

From this perspective, it would follow that NPDA debaters would be trained using the universal audience. However, currently, the trend in NPDA debate seems to be to replicate a particular audience as a universal audience. This happens in two ways: 1) Coaches preferring a particular judging paradigm over others, and 2) Graduating students filling the role of assistant coach.

First, it is important to note that all debate coaches have some degree of validity on their interpretation on what a debate should look like, what kinds of arguments are persuasive, and how he or she would like students to argue. Given this, it is natural that each coach will prefer a particular paradigm. However, when a particular paradigm is taught as the only paradigm, students begin replacing the universal audience with a [their coach's preferred] particular audience. For example, when I was the Director of Forensics at my alma mater during my Ph.D. program, my most successful debate team, a team of former high school Tournament Of Champions debaters, pre-law students, and extremely bright and informed young men, had a specific view of the type of audience they wanted in a judge, while my assistant coach had another interpretation, and I had

yet a third interpretation. The students were looking for a policy debate oriented judge; my assistant was looking for an advocacy/performance friendly judge; and I was looking for a trichotomy stickler. It took tournament after tournament of realizing that the particular audiences we looking for may or may not ever judge our rounds; so instead, we had to work on returning to the more traditional, more universal interpretation of the NPDA debate audience, without completely disregarding the particular audiences that we encountered. This turn we took is supported by Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, (1969):

> We believe, then, that audiences are not independent of one another, that particular concrete audiences are capable of validating a concept of the universal audience which characterizes them. On the other hand, it is the undefined universal audience that is invoked to pass judgment on what is the concept of the universal audience appropriate to such a concrete audience. (p. 35)

The universal audience of NPDA is one that shares the values and understanding of all of the members of NPDA, while particular audiences within the activity are specific judges that we encounter in rounds along the way. Further, Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (1969) discussed the "centrality of values to all forms of discourse" p. 281). The affirming party must make use of value appeals in order to capture their audience. Any practical argumentative discourse involves a level of value discussion.

Even more specifically, in contemporary intercollegiate competitive parliamentary debate, there are typically three different types of resolutions that are debated: fact, value, and policy, supporting the notion that language stems from a community and from habit. The type of resolution that is the most controversial and arguably the most difficult to debate are resolutions of value. "A resolution of value compares value claims or postulates an expression of a 'good' that is subject to debate" (Meany & Shuster, 2002, p. 30). What determines what is truly good or bad must be presented as a comparison within the debate. In terms of specific argument techniques, Meany and Shuster (2002) pointed out that value comparisons are especially important in counterplan debates. When both teams in a policy round are arguing that an action be taken, it is essential that the judge is offered reasons to prefer one plan over the other. These reasons are argued in the form of values.

Additionally, in terms of judges themselves, because there is very little interest or accessibility to becoming a judge within the forensic community without first being a competitor, the coaches and judges of tomorrow come from the teams of today. This is not inherently negative, nor does the problem that I describe happen every time a former competitor becomes a coach. However, often the former student, now coach's interpretation of the most valid audience comes from his or her coach. So, rather than expanding our universal audience, we tend to perpetuate the particular audience that our coach(es) prefer(s). Ultimately, this can lead to judging paradigms ignored or applied to more than one judge. For instance, Infante (1988) argued that adaptive communication skills

are of the utmost importance in any form of debate. While he wrote that one must analyze one's specific audience to make the best argument for that particular audience, he also conceded that ". . . there seems to be uniformity in the ways in which we organize and change beliefs and attitudes . . ." (Infante, 1988, p. 102). Hence, Perelman's principle of the universal audience may not work for specific content. However, this principle can be useful in structuring arguments in general. "The message is adapted to the intended receiver" (Infante, 1988, p. 101). The speaker does, in fact, create the audience in his or her mind before making an argument as Perelman said.

As a judge, I have seen students read (or listen to) my judging philosophy and adapt, and I have seen them either not adapt at all (speak to a 'universal' NPDA judge) or adapt to someone else entirely. When I was judging at the NPDA national tournament, for example, a debate partnership from a southern university, whom I had seen debate numerous times, ignored my value of the trichotomy and ran a policy case on (what I saw as an obvious) value resolution. The opposing team, whom I had never seen before, from a university in the northwest, had read my philosophy and went for suicide-resolutionality (trichotomy), and in the Member of Government speech, I was told by the team I was more familiar with, "Obviously you don't care if it was 'supposed' to be a value resolution." This is similar to rounds (usually in the novice or junior divisions) when debaters make comments like, "clearly you're pro-choice, fiscally liberal, anti-military, against the death penalty, against guns . . ." or whathaveyou. While the last two I listed actually are accurate, there is no possible way that the debater would know that by looking at me. Yes, the NPDA debate community, like most forensic communities, tends to be left of center, but those are particulars outside of the universal NPDA audience.

Specifically, the rhetor creates the ideal audience in his or her own mind, which makes it entirely real to the rhetor. It seems that some contemporary argumentation scholars would agree. For example, Lundsford, Ruszkiewicz, and Walters (2004) revealed that when making an argument, "you will almost always be an intended reader [or audience member], one who exists in your own mind" (p. 53). The intended audience can never be anyone other than the audience that exists in one's mind. However, audience analysis can, perhaps, make the audience in one's mind, and the audience in reality, share an increased number of similarities.

Implications

Instead of seeing the universal and particular audiences as interdependent and interrelated, the current trend seems to be to substitute a particular audience as the universal audience. This has two primary consequences: 1) Competitors' audience analysis and adaptation is stunted, and 2) The students who are attracted to and stay in NPDA debate are limited.

First, when a particular audience (or judge) is substituted for the universal audience, students stop (if they ever started) learning to analyze and adapt to diverse audiences, and rather than valuing the diversity of audiences, this preference and practice of valuing homogeneity continues. I have heard debater after

debater (former teammates, students, friends, etc.) claim that they never lost a round; judges made wrong decisions. While this may boil down to egoism, it may also stem from an expectation that judges should and will judge a certain way, and when they don't, rather than reflecting on the student's performance, the conclusion is drawn that the judge was wrong (not a part of the particular audience the student was seeking). Audience analysis is needed, however, at all levels of NPDA. Though it is the most prestigious NPDA tournament, and expected to be an entirely homogenous audience, Swift (2007b) found that even the National Parliamentary Tournament of Excellence (NPTE) judges fit into the categories of tabula rasa, kritikal, ultra-liberal, stock-issues, communication-centered, and interventionalist. Continuing to prepare for the universal rather than particular audience may avoid this implication in the future.

Secondly, and arguably most importantly, this elitist approach to who should debate and how, may be already limiting the students who want to join NPDA debate teams, and those who would like to stay. As Diers (2011) aptly notes, our activity is dying, if not already dead. Sure, there are a number of reasons for this. A primary reason might be the very narrow, particular audience that some coaches teach students is the universal audience. For example, while one of the purposes behind developing parliamentary debate as an alternative form was in reaction to the research burden and speed-talk of CEDA and NDT, these practices are quickly gaining reward in NPDA. This alone is not scary, but if that is the only successful way to debate in NPDA, then our audience is shrinking, and so is our pool of potential competitors.

Conclusion

Because the world of parliamentary debate (as well as forensics generally, e.g., Swift, 2006) is obsessed with norms, the universal audience may be currently and effectively functioning. The universal audience is the ideal audience constructed in the rhetor's mind. Unfortunately the ideal audience in many NPDA debaters' minds actually represents one, very particular audience or judge. The coaches and judges of the activity dictate this particular universal audience in intercollegiate parliamentary debate to their competitors. Because the competitors are most likely to become the future coaches and judges, they are likely to instill the same mindset in their future competitors. Hence, the audience in the activity remains both particular and stagnant. Perelman (1968) reminds us:

> It would seem that we are never sure of the rationality of our theses as long as we have not submitted them to the proof of communication and criticism, a proof that cannot be dissociated from rhetoric, in the expanded and non-pejorative sense of this word. Only on this condition can I distinguish between what I believe to be true (faith) and what I know to be true (science). Let us repeat that in our perspective, the one who is able to convince a universal audience cannot conceal from the audience the techniques of argumentation that he is using, because he is himself a part of this audience. Nor does anyone have the right to assert that rhetorical discourse is

unilateral. This assertion holds for certain rhetorical discourses, but not for all, and certainly not for those that interest the philosopher. (p. 170)

There is always a larger audience and a deeper understanding. In the end, the universal audience is one fabricated and perpetuated by *we* (yes, myself included), the members of NPDA. While we pay lip service to audience analysis, our coaching and judging practices tend to reward those who speak to those within the norm. This is not inherently poor practice. However, we ought to call these practices what they truly are—rewarding those who conform most closely to the norms, which is not always the same as the most sound argument or 'the better job of debating.'

References

Adams, W. C. & Cox, E. S. (1995). Pi Kappa Delta's leadership role in competitive debate: toward fairness, civility, and accessibility. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta, 80*(4), 38-56.

Aden, R. C. (1991). Reconsidering the laboratory metaphor: Forensics as liberal art. *National Forensic Journal, 9*(2), 97-108.

Bartanen, M. D. & Frank, D. A. (1999). Reclaiming a heritage: A proposal for rhetorically grounded academic debate. *Parliamentary Debate: The Journal of the National Parliamentary Debate Association,* 6, 31-54.

Cates, C. M. & Eaves, M. H. (2010). Back to the future in forensics: CEDA vs. parliamentary debate. *The Forensic, 95*(1), 21-27.

Constantinides, H. (1999) Practical reasoning in organizations: Perelman's universal and particular audiences. Paper presented at the National Communication Association/American Forensic Association (Alta Conference on Argumentation) in Alta, Utah.

Cronn-Mills, D., & Golden, A. (1997). The "unwritten rules" in oral interpretation. *SpeakerPoints*. *4*(2). Retrieved November 1, 2003, from http://www.phirhopi.org/prp/spkrpts4.2/rice.html

Diers, A. R. (2011). 'I don't want to become a rules cop': An organizational culture and leadership discourse analysis of the NPDA as a failed organization. *Speaker & Gavel 48*(2), 32-52.

Epstein, S. B. (1992). What parliamentary debate can offer small programs: An observation. *Parliamentary Debate: The Journal of the Western States Parliamentary Debate Association, 1*, 51-60.

German, K. M. (1985). Finding a methodology for rhetorical criticism. *National Forensic Journal, 3*(2), 86-101.

Infante, D. A. (1988). *Arguing constructively*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

Johnson, J. A. (1994). A veteran director of forensics looks at the future of parliamentary debate. *Parliamentary Debate: The Journal of the National Parliamentary Debate Association, 3*, 1-4.

Klope, D. C. (1986). Toward a conceptual definition of duo interpretation. *National Forensic Journal, 3(*2), 1-11

Kuster, T. A. (2002). Appreciating the "public" nature of parliamentary debate: A dozen benefits. *Speaker Points, 9*(2). Retrieved September 19, 2006 from: http://phirhopi.org/prp/spkrpts9.2/kuster.html

Kuster, T. A., Olson, L. M., & Loging, J. L. (2001). Reaching out to the wider community by enlisting non-professional judges in parliamentary debate. *Speaker Points, 7*(2). Retrieved September 19, 2006 from: http://www.phirhopi.org/prp/spkrpts7.2/kuster.html

Lundsford, A. A., Ruszkiewicz, J. J., & Walters, K. (2004). *Everything's an argument with readings*. Boston, MA: Bedford/St. Martin's.

Maddex, M. C. (2005). A new wave of argumentation: An examination for the need of performance in parliamentary debate. *CDE Journal, 2*(1). Retrieved September 21, 2006 from: http://www.cdedebate.com/journal/2_1/Madddex_2_1.htm

Meany, J., & Shuster, K. (2002). *Art, argument, and advocacy*. New York, NY: International Debate Education Association (IDEA).

Perelman, C. (1968). Reply to Mr. Zaner. *Philosophy & Rhetoric, 1*(3), 168-170.

Perelman, C. & Olbrechts-Tyteca, L. (1969). *The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation.* Trans. John Wilkinson and Purcell Weaver. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.

Preston, C. T. (2006). Debating about debate: A symbolic convergence theory meta-analysis of educational reform movements in intercollegiate competitive debate. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta, 91*, 15-26.

Sheckels Jr, T. F. & Warfield, A. C. (1990). Parliamentary debate: A description and a justification. *Argumentation and Advocacy, 27*(2), 86-96.

Snider, A. C. (1984). Gaming as a paradigm for academic debate. *National Forensic Journal, 2*(2), 119-134.

Swift, C. L. (2012). This house would not mix burdens: The conflation of fact, value, and policy in NPDA. *Journal of Communication and Theatre Association of Minnesota*, 50-65 Retrieved from http://www.mnsu.edu/cmst/ctam/ctamj/ctamj2012.pdf.

Swift, C. L. (2006). Conflating rules, norms, and ethics in intercollegiate forensics. *Speaker & Gavel, 43*, 46-86.

Swift, C. L., & Vourvoulias, C. M. (2006). Argumentativeness, verbal aggressiveness, and relational satisfaction in the parliamentary debate dyad. *The Journal of the National Parliamentary Debate Association, 11*(1), 1-25.

Swift, C. L. (2007a). NPDA as a return to the Polis. *CDE Online Journal of Forensics, 3*(2), Retrieved from http://www.cdedebate.com/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=112&Itemid=32

Swift, C. L. (2007b). Pre-fiat vs. post fiat kritik implications debate, cost benefit analysis criterion, or just water the house plant?: National Parliamentary Tournament of Excellence judging paradigms. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta, 97*(2), 27-32.

Swift, C. L. (2007c). This house would resolve: An examination of the internal/external spat in NPDA. *SpeakerPoints, 11*(1). Retrieved from

http://www.phirhopi.org/prp/spkrpts11.1/swift.html

Swift, C. L. (2008). *This house would ethically engage: A critical examination of coach and competitor leadership in National Parliamentary Debate Association (NPDA) debate*. Saarbruken, Germany: Verlag Dr. Muller.

Swift, C. L. (2012). This house would not mix burdens: The conflation of fact, value, and policy in NPDA. *Journal of Communication and Theatre Association of Minnesota*, 39, 50-65. Retrieved from http://www.mnsu.edu/cmst/ctam/ctamj/ctamj2012.pdf.

VerLinden, J. (1987). The metacritical model for judging interpretation. *National Forensic Journal, 5*(2), 57-66

VerLinden, J. (1997). The unwritten rules in public address. *Speaker Points, 4*(2). Retrieved November 1, 2003, from http://www.phirhopi.org/prp/spkrpts4.2/verl.html

Crystal Lane Swift, Ph.D., is a tenured professor of Communication at Mt. San Antonio College and an adjunct professor of Communication at California State University, Northridge. An earlier version of this paper earned the honor of top student paper in the Southern Forensics Division at the 2007 Southern States Communication Association Conference. The author thanks Dr. Andrew King, Professor of Communication for his contribution to this projection, and Kenneth Klawitter, Professor of Communication and Theatre at Mt. San Antonio College for his help with the final edit.

A Functional Analysis of 2008 and 2012 Presidential Candidacy Announcement Speeches

William L. Benoit & Mark Glantz

Abstract

This study investigates messages in the surfacing phase of the presidential campaign, through a content analysis of presidential candidacy announcement speeches from the 2008 and 2012 elections. This study applied the Functional Theory of Political Campaign Discourse to nine Democratic announcement speeches from 2008, 11 Republican announcement addresses from 2008, and 12 Republican announcement speeches from 2012. This work extends previous research on announcement speeches from 1960-2004 (Benoit, Henson, Whalen, & Pier, 2007). Overall, announcements from 2008 and 2012 used acclaims (75%) more than attacks (25%) or defenses (0.5%). The same announcements discussed policy more than character (58% to 42%); Democrats in 2008 discussed policy more, and character less, than Republicans in that campaign. General goals and ideals were used more often as the basis of acclaims than attacks in these speeches. These speeches were more negative (25% to 22% attacks) and discussed policy more (58% to 50%) and character less (42% to 50%) than past announcements. In 2008, Democratic speeches discussed Democratic issues more, and Republican issues less, than Republican speeches.

Key Terms: presidential announcements, surfacing, functions, 2008, 2012, Democratic, Republican

Introduction

> I'm Newt Gingrich and I'm announcing my candidacy for President of the United States because I believe we can return America to hope and opportunity, to full employment, to real security, to an American energy program, to a balanced budget. (Gingrich, 2011)

> And if you look at the record of spending under this President, he came in, sure he came in with a problem. And then in that hole that he was in, he kept digging and digging and digging. Now for every dollar we spend thanks to this President, forty cents is borrowed. Forty cents is going to be put on every man, woman, and child to pay the interest on for the rest of their lives. (Santorum, 2011)

> I've never introduced a bill in Washington, DC to emphasize heroin. So they take all of what I said and turn it around and say, he would legalize heroin. Well you know the plain truth is that heroin at one time in our history was legalized and there was essentially no abuse of it, and it's only in our recent history.... I happen to have a personal real disgust with the abuse of drugs,

but it's all drugs, those that are considered illegal, and I think physicians prescribe way too much medications. (Paul, 2011)

Although some scholars have argued that the contemporary U.S. political system operates in a perpetual campaign mode marked by continuous political jockeying, public opinion polling, and media speculation (Blumenthal, 1980), the campaign for America's highest office does not officially begin until candidates formally announce their intent to run for President. This occasion provides an opportunity to lay out a rationale for their candidacy. Trent (1994) has argued that it is important to study the communication that characterizes the surfacing stage of a campaign because it "sets the scene for all that follows" and "frequently determines what will happen in later stages" (p. 45). These speeches may not be watched by millions of voters, but the media and other candidates do pay attention: announcement speeches provide a public record of the beginning of a candidate's campaign.

On April 17, 2006, former Alaska Democratic Senator Mike Gravel became the first person to formally announce his bid for the presidency in 2008. This announcement came 861 days before the Democratic Party was scheduled to hold their nominating convention in Denver in August of 2008. Sam Brownback, Senator from Kansas, announced his candidacy on January 20, 2007, becoming the first Republican to officially enter the race (590 days before his party's convention). On April 21, 2011, Gary Johnson was the first Republican to announce his candidacy for president, 494 days before the Republican Nominating Convention. Table 1 presents the formal announcement dates for candidates in the 2008 and 2012 primary campaigns. These announcements, and all those that followed, marked the first stages of the 2008 and 2012 primary campaign seasons.

Table 1
Presidential Primary Announcement Speeches 2008 and 2012

Candidate	Date	Days before Convention	Words
2008 Democrats			
Joe Biden	1/31/07	572	760
Hillary Clinton	1/20/07	583	1140
Chris Dodd	1/11/07	592	1119
John Edwards	12/28/06	637	4037
Mike Gravel	4/17/06	861	3827
Dennis Kucinich	12/12/06	622	2256
Barack Obama	2/10/07	562	2581
Bill Richardson	1/21/07	582	1444
Tom Vilsack	11/30/07	634	1268
Mean		627	2048

2008 Republicans			
Sam Brownback	1/20/07	590	1186
Jim Gilmore	4/26/07	494	2316
Mike Huckabee	1/28/07	582	2755
Duncan Hunter	1/25/07	585	2691
Alan Keyes	9/14/07	353	1969
John McCain	4/25/07	495	2350
Ron Paul	2/19/07	560	943
Mitt Romney	2/13/07	566	2087
Tom Tancredo	4/2/07	518	1195
Fred Thompson	9/6/07	361	2450
Tommy Thompson	4/4/07	516	2465
Mean		511	2037
2012 Republicans			
Michele Bachman	6/13/11	442	2431
Herman Cain	5/21/11	464	2961
Newt Gingrich	5/11/11	474	347
Jon Huntsman	6/21/11	434	1464
Gary Johnson	4/21/11	494	561
Thaddeus McCotter	7/2/11	422	920
Ron Paul	5/13/11	472	5555
Tim Pawlenty	5/23/11	462	2332
Rick Perry	8/13/11	379	2408
Buddy Roemer	7/21/11	370	1370
Mitt Romney	6/2/11	452	2349
Rick Santorum	6/6/11	446	2513
Mean		443	2101
1960-2004 Mean		386	2108

This study investigates the content of candidate announcement speeches from the 2008 and 2012 presidential campaigns. To begin, we review the pertinent literature in this area. Then, the theory driving this research, the Functional Theory of Political Campaign Discourse, will be explicated, and hypotheses and research questions for this study will be advanced. This is followed by a description of the method and presentation of the results.

Literature Review

Several areas of research can inform this analysis of 2008 and 2012 announcements of presidential candidacy. The first approach is Judith Trent's pioneering work on the nature and function of the surfacing phase of political campaigns. The second is research which has already applied the Functional Theory of Political Campaign Discourse to announcement speeches given in previous

presidential campaigns.

The Surfacing Phase

Candidates' formal announcements of their candidacy can be placed in the context of the surfacing phase of presidential campaigns. This "pre-primary" phase of presidential campaigns is marked by candidates' "initial efforts to create a presidential interest and image for themselves in the public imagination" (Trent, 1978, p. 282). According to Trent and Friedenberg (2004), this time in a campaign serves seven purposes. First, it permits candidates to demonstrate their fitness for office. Second, it initiates important, long-held political rituals. Third, the process gives the public an opportunity to learn about candidates who may otherwise be relatively unknown. The fourth purpose of the surfacing phase is to develop voter expectations of candidate style. Fifth, this time period helps determine what campaign issues will dominate a campaign. The sixth purpose is that this phase of the campaign operates as a process for selecting serious contenders for the White House. Last, candidate-media relations are established during this time.

Because the early campaign phase is marked by a lack of information about most presidential contenders and policy issues, candidates are afforded the opportunity to inform voters about their candidacy and influence perceptions of their character and policy positions (Kendall, 2000; Popkin, 1991). Diamond and Bates (1993) explained that this is why the early stages of campaigns are so filled with biographical information about candidates.

Politicians' formal announcements of their presidential candidacy are one of the most important elements of the early campaign stage. The timing of these announcements often prompts much discussion, as candidates attempt to use these occasions to generate as much interest from media and voters as possible. According to Trent and Friedenberg (2004), announcement speeches may serve four valuable purposes. First, they signal a candidate's intention to run for office. Second, they can deter electoral competition, discouraging potential opponents from running. Third, they indicate a person's reasons for running. Fourth and finally, they introduce campaign themes. Until recently however, the actual content of these addresses had gone virtually unexplored.

Functions and Topics of Announcement Speeches

Benoit, Henson, Whalen, and Pier (2007) used Functional Theory to analyze presidential announcement speeches from 1960 to 2004. These speeches were given an average of 386 days before their candidate's respective convention, and their mean length was 2,184 words. Results indicated that the tone of these messages is similar to that of other campaign discourse forms, such as acceptance speeches. Acclaims (positive statements) were most common function (78%), followed by attacks (22%), and then defenses (0.3%).

The topics of the utterances in these messages were split equally between policy (50%) and character (50%), indicating that the early campaign phase might in fact lead candidates to discuss character more than they typically do in other forms of campaign discourse (acceptance addresses from 1952-2004, for

example, used 55% policy and 45% character; Benoit, 2007) . Differences were found between Democrats and Republicans, as Democrats were found to speak more about policy and less about character than Republicans. General goals dominated the policy topics (53%), followed by past deeds (32%), and future plans (16%). A closer look at the form of the character topics revealed that statements about ideals were most common (48%), followed by personal qualities (34%), and leadership abilities (18%).

Theoretical Foundations

This study is based on the Functional Theory of Political Campaign Discourse (Benoit, 2007). Functional Theory posits that political candidates use their campaign messages to distinguish themselves from opponents. A candidate does not need to disagree with opponents on every issue; however, a candidate must be perceived as preferable to opponents on some points and achieving this goal requires some distinctions between opponents. Candidates use three functions (acclaims—positive statements about the candidate; attacks—criticisms of an opponent; defenses—refutations of attacks) and these functions occur on two topics (policy—governmental action and problems amenable to governmental action; character—the candidates' personality). The first excerpt at the beginning of this essay illustrates acclaims (Gingrich, 2011), the second is an example of an attack (Santorum, 2011), and the last passage exemplifies a defense (Paul, 2011).

This study extends previous research on the nature of presidential candidacy announcement speeches to include the 2008 presidential campaign (with contested primaries in both political parties) and the 2012 presidential campaign (in which only the Republican nomination was contested). Most research on presidential campaigns focuses on the general election period; research on the primary is also common. There is little empirical research on the content of presidential campaign messages in the "surfacing" phase of the contemporary campaign (see Trent, 1978).

Building on past research into announcement speeches (Benoit, Henson, Whalen, & Pier, 2007), and consistent with Functional Theory (Benoit, 2007), we test five hypotheses and answer two research questions. First, Functional Theory argues that acclaims (although not necessarily automatically accepted by the audience) have no inherent drawbacks. Attacks should be less common than acclaims because voters dislike mudslinging (Merritt, 1984; Stewart, 1975). Defenses are expected to be the least frequent function because they have three potential drawbacks. First, defenses must identify an attack to refute it, which could remind or inform the audience of a potential weakness. Second, defenses are likely to target a candidate's weaknesses, which means that responding to it could take a candidate off-message. Third, using defenses could create the undesirable impression that a candidate is reactive rather than proactive. Hence, we predict that:

> H1. Announcement speeches from 2008 and 2012 will use acclaims more than attacks and attacks more than defenses.

Functional Theory predicts that, in general, candidates will discuss policy more than character. Presidents implement governmental policy; some may view them as a role model (which would make character important) but they are probably not in the majority. Furthermore, research has established more voters report that policy is the most important determinant of their vote for president and candidates who stress policy more than their opponents—and character less—are more likely to win elections (Benoit, 2003). These considerations lead us to predict that:

H2. Announcement speeches from 2008 and 2012 will discuss policy more than character.

Past research has established that Democrats tend to emphasize policy even more than Republicans and character less than Republicans (Benoit, 2003). This may due to the fact that Republican ideology generally prefers private action (e.g., charity) to governmental action to solve social problems, which may mean that Republicans discuss policy less, and character more, than Democrats. Hence, we predict that:

H3. Announcement speeches from Democrats in 2008 will discuss policy more, and character less, than Republicans in 2008.

Functional Theory divides policy utterances into three forms. Past deeds discuss a candidate's successes (acclaims) or an opponent's failures (attacks) in office. Future plans are specific proposals for governmental action (means) whereas general goals are the ends sought. Some goals, such as creating jobs or keeping American safe, cannot really be criticized. This means that general goals will be used more frequently as the basis for acclaims than attacks. Therefore, we predict that:

H4. Announcement Speeches from 2008 and 2012 will use general goals as the basis for acclaims more often than attacks.

Functional theory divides character comments into those concerned with personal qualities (character traits), leadership ability (executive or administration ability), and ideals, which represent values such as freedom or equality. As with general goals, some ideals are simply difficult or impossible to reasonably attack. Who could attack an opponent who seeks equality or justice? Therefore, we predict that:

H5. Announcement Speeches from 2008 and 2012 will use ideals as the basis for acclaims more often than attacks.

As just explained, Functional Theory divides policy utterances and character utterances into subforms (see, e.g., Benoit, 2007 for illustrative examples).

We also answer two research questions about the distribution of these forms of policy and character:

> RQ1. What are the proportions of the three forms of policy in 2008 and 2012 announcement speeches?
> RQ2. What are the proportions of the three forms of character in 2008 and 2012 announcement speeches?

One additional prediction, derived from issue ownership theory (Petrocik, 1996) will be investigated in this study. Over time, each of the two major political parties in the U.S. has become associated with different issues; more voters think one party can better deal with a given issue than the other party. For example, people tend to believe that Democrats can do a better job handling such issues as education and the environment; citizens are prone to think that Republicans can do a better job handling such issues as taxes and crime. Petrocik (1996) predicts that presidential candidates are likely to discuss the issues owned by their own political party more often than candidates from the other party. Research has supported this prediction in presidential nomination acceptance addresses and general television spots (Petrocik, Hansen, & Benoit, 2003/2004) as well as in presidential primary and general election debates (Benoit & Hansen, 2004). This study will investigate this prediction in the 2008 presidential primary debates, in which nominations for both major parties were contested:

> H6. Democrats discuss Democratic issues more, and Republican issues less, than Republicans in 2008 American presidential primary debates.

Together, the tests of these hypotheses and the answers to these research questions will extend our knowledge of surfacing messages in political campaign announcement speeches.

Method

To ensure comparability of data between this study and previous research, we followed the same procedures used for other Functional analyses generally and the previous research on announcement speeches from 1960 to 2004 specifically (Benoit, Hansen, Whalen, & Pier, 2007). Functional Theory unitizes the texts of campaign messages into themes. Themes are complete ideas, claims, or arguments; a single theme can vary in length from one phrase to an entire paragraph (see, e.g., Berelson, 1952; Holsti, 1969). The coders first identified themes present in these speeches. Then each theme was categorized by function: acclaim, attack, or defense. Next, coders categorized the topic of each theme as policy or character and identified the form of policy or character for each theme.

Many of the announcements analyzed here were located at www.4president.org. When necessary, additional or more accurate transcripts were taken from candidates' webpages and major news databases such as Lexis-Nexis Academic. The sample includes speeches from nine Democratic primary

candidates in 2008, 11 Republican candidates in 2008, and 12 Republican candidates in 2012. The texts included in this analysis take a variety of forms and were given across a diversity of occasions. Some candidates made pre-announcements and/or multiple announcements in different cities and via different media (we used the earliest speech we could locate when more than one was available). Whereas some candidates, such as John Edwards, delivered traditional addresses, other candidates such as Tom Tancredo and Mike Huckabee made their announcements during radio or television interviews. Still others, such as Fred Thompson, chose to broadcast video of their announcements view the World Wide Web. The mean word count for candidates from both parties was 2,064, and these speeches were given an average of 518 days before their respective party's nominating convention.

Two coders analyzed the debates. Inter-coder reliability was calculated with Cohen's (1960) *kappa*. Five announcement speeches were coded by both coders to calculate inter-coder reliability. *Kappa* was .94 for functions, .89 for topics, .92 for forms of policy, and .89 for forms of character. Landis and Koch (1977) indicate that *kappa*s of .81 or higher reflect almost perfect agreement between coders, so these data have acceptable reliability.

Lexis-Nexis polls from the Roper Center in 2007 were employed to select the issues employed to test the last hypothesis on issue ownership. Iraq, the economy/jobs, health care, education, and the environment were chosen as issues owned by the Democratic party; immigration, terrorism, abortion, taxes, and crime were selected as Republican issues. Use of these issues were counted and compiled into Democratic and Republican issues.

Results

This section presents the results of our study of 2008 and 2012 announcements of presidential candidacy. Tests of each hypothesis and answers to the two research questions will be presented next.

Functions of 2008 and 2012 Announcement Speeches

Overall, acclaims were most common function (75%) in presidential candidate announcement speeches. For instance, former Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich (2011) boasted of his fitness for office by saying,

> As Speaker of the House, I worked to reform welfare, balance the budget, control spending, to cut taxes to create economic growth – unemployment came down from 5.6% to under 4. For four years we balanced the budget and paid off $405 billion in debt. We've done it before, we can do it again.

This statement contains multiple acclaims as Gingrich lists several accomplishments and then claims that he can duplicate them as president. Attacks were the second most common function in these announcement speeches (25%). An exemplary instance of such attacks was provided by Barack Obama (2007), who launched a string of criticisms against the sitting Bush administration in 2008.

> For the last six years we've been told that our mounting debts don't matter, we've been told that the anxiety Americans feel about rising health care costs and stagnant wages are an illusion, we've been told that climate change is a hoax, and that tough talk and an ill-conceived war can replace democracy, and strategy, and foresight.

Instead of remarking about his own positive qualities, Obama spoke about the Bush administration's failures, including a poor economy, bad environmental policy, and the war in Iraq.

Defenses were very rare in these announcements (0.5%). Mike Huckabee (2007) was one of the few candidates who did defend himself on the occasion of his announcement:

> Did we raise taxes on fuel? Yes, but 80 percent of the people voted on it because it was on the ballot. So it wasn't that I raised it. I joined with 80 percent of the people in my state to improve what was the worst road system in the country.

In this instance, Huckabee acknowledges an attack on his decision to raise fuel taxes, and then attempts to explain or otherwise "defend" his position by invoking the popular opinion of citizens in his home state of Arkansas.

A *chi-square goodness-of-fit test* reveals that these three functions occurred with different frequencies (χ^2 [df = 1] = 1585.2, p < .0001). The first hypothesis was confirmed. These data are displayed in Table 2.

Table 2
Functions of Announcement Speeches

	Acclaims	Attacks	Defenses
2008 Democrats	404 (79%)	107 (21%)	1 (0.2%)
2008 Republicans	460 (84%)	84 (15%)	4 (1%)
2012 Republicans	514 (66%)	266 (34%)	4 (0.5%)
2008-2012 Total	1378 (75%)	457 (25%)	9 (0.5%)
1960-2004	3744 (78%)	1052 (22%)	10 (0.3%)

Topics of 2008 and 2012 Announcement Speeches

Overall, policy utterances (58%) were more common than character utterances (42%) in these announcements. An example of a policy utterance can be found in this series of attacks by Mitt Romney (2011) on the incumbent Democratic president:

> Barack Obama has failed America. When he took office, the economy was in recession. He made it worse. And he made it last longer. Three years later, over 16 million Americans are out of work or have just quit looking. Millions more are underemployed. Three years later, unemployment is still

> above 8%, a figure he said his stimulus would keep from happening. Three years later, foreclosures are still at record levels. Three years later the prices of homes continue to fall. Three years later, our national debt has grown nearly as large as our entire economy. Families are buried under higher prices for food and higher prices for gasoline.

The topics of recession, unemployment, foreclosures, the national debt, and inflation addressed in this quotation are clear examples of policy utterances. Herman Cain (2011) offered this example of a discussion of his character:

> I grew up right here in Atlanta, Georgia.... I stand in the shadows of my upbringing. I stand here today as the son of a chauffeur and a domestic worker, who taught me and my brother three of the most important values we could have ever learned. Belief in God. Belief in what we could for ourselves. And belief in this exceptional nation called the United States of America.

This passage discusses both his personal qualities (humble beginnings) and his ideals (three values). A *chi-square goodness-of-fit* test establishes that these values are significantly different (χ^2 [df = 1] = 47.34, $p < .0001$), confirming the second hypothesis.

The third hypothesis anticipated that the two political parties would differ in their emphasis of the two topics of campaign discourse. In 2008, Democrats discussed policy more (66% to 61%) and character less (34% to 39%) than Republicans (χ^2 [df = 1] = 3.92, $p < .05$, $\varphi = .06$). So, H3 was confirmed with these data. See Table 3 for these data.\

Table 3
Topic of Announcement Speeches

	Policy	Character
2008 Democrats	336 (66%)	175 (34%)
2008 Republicans	332 (61%)	212 (39%)
2012 Republicans	396 (51%)	384 (49%)
2008-2012 Total	1067 (58%)	771 (42%)
1960-2004	2391 (50%)	2406 (50%)

Forms of Policy in 2008 and 2012 Announcement Speeches

The first research question concerned the distribution of the three forms of policy in these announcement speeches. In this sample, past deeds (51%) were the most popular form of policy utterance, followed by general goals (47%), and then future plans (3%). It seems likely that future plans—specific policy proposals (means)—would be less common at the beginning of a campaign; although some candidates campaigned informally prior to their announcement

(Blumenthal, 1980), the candidates and their staff may not have developed all of their proposals before their announcement speeches.

H4 expected that general goals would be used more often as the basis for acclaims than attacks. In these data, candidates were significantly more likely to use utterances about general goals to praise themselves (91%) than to attack their opponent (9%). Statistical analysis using a *chi-square goodness-of-fit* test confirmed that this difference was significant (χ^2 [df = 1] = 384.4, $p < .0001$). These data are reported in Table 4.

Table 4
Forms of Policy in Announcement Addresses

	Past Deeds		Future Plans		General Goals	
	Acclaims	Attacks	Acclaims	Attacks	Acclaims	Attacks
2008 Democrats	79	83	5	2	161	7
	162 (48%)		7 (2%)		168 (50%)	
2008 Republicans	69	72	8	1	181	1
	141 (42%)		9 (3%)		182 (55%)	
2012 Republicans	56	153	14	7	128	38
	209 (53%)		21 (5%)		166 (42%)	
2008-2012 Total	204	308	27	10	470	46
	512 (48%)		37 (3%)		516 (48%)	
1960-2004	203	526	343	15	1222	82
	729 (32%)		358 (16%)		1204 (53%)	

Forms of Character in 2008 and 2012 Announcement Speeches

When addressing character, announcement speeches most often discussed ideals (46%), followed by personal qualities (39%), and then leadership ability (14%). The last prediction expected that candidates would use ideals, like general goals, more to acclaim than to attack. This hypothesis was confirmed in these data: 95% of ideals were acclaims and 5% were attacks. A *chi-square goodness-of-fit* test confirmed that these frequencies were significantly different (χ^2 [*df* = 1] = 493.23, $p < .0001$). These data can be found in Table 5.

Table 5
Forms of Character in 2008 Announcement Addresses

	Personal Qualities		Leadership Abilities		Ideals	
	Acclaims	Attacks	Acclaims	Attacks	Acclaims	Attacks
2008 Democrats	84	7	15	9	60	0
	91 (52%)		24 (14%)		60 (34%)	
2008 Republicans	87	3	21	4	94	3
	93 (42%)		27 (12%)		101 (46%)	
2012 Republicans	94	34	43	20	179	25
	128 (32%)		63 (16%)		204 (52%)	
2008-2012 Total	265	44	79	33	333	28
	309 (40%)		112 (14%)		361 (46%)	
1960-2004	501	212	323	118	1052	100
	813 (34%)		441 (18%)		1152 (48%)	

Issue Ownership in 2008 Announcement Speeches

Hypothesis six predicted that announcements from Democrats would discuss Democratic issues more, and Republican issues less, than Republican announcements. Content analysis confirmed this prediction in the 2008 presidential announcement speeches. Democrats discussed Democratic issues more (86% to 52%) and Republican issues less (14% to 48%) than Republicans. Statistical analysis confirms that these differences are significant (χ^2 [df = 1] = 41.54, p < .0001, φ = .37). See Table 6.

Table 6.
Democratic and Republican Issues Addressed in 2008 Presidential Primary Debates

	Democratic Issues	Republican Issues
Democrats	**139 (86%)**	23 (14%)
Republicans	73 (52%)	**68 (48%)**

Discussion

There are some important differences between the announcement speeches analyzed here and those analyzed by previous research. For instance, candidates in 2008 made these addresses an average of 563 days before their party's official nominating convention (in 2012, it was not as early: 443 days before the Republican National Convention). This means that in 2008 politicians were announcing their candidacy 57 days earlier than they were in 2004, and 177 days earlier than they were in the years 1960-2004. This is consistent with Benoit, Henson, Whalen, and Pier's (2008) finding that, in general, presidential hopefuls are announcing their candidacy earlier in the campaign over time and consistent with the phenomenon of "front-loading" presidential primary campaigns (Mayer & Busch, 2004).

Where length of oration is concerned however, these speeches were actually a bit shorter than they have been in previous years. The mean word count of 2,042 (and of 2011 words in 2012) indicates a roughly comparable speech length to those orations given in 2004 (2,412 words) and 1960-2004 (2,108). These results are interesting because previous research had revealed a tendency for word count to increase over time (Benoit, Henson, Whalen, & Pier, 2008).

Results of the functional analysis conducted here reveal other important content differences between the more recent announcements of presidential candidacy and those given in previous years. First, these speeches included somewhat fewer acclaims (75% to 82%) and more attacks (25% to 22%) than those speeches given between 1960 and 2004 (χ^2 [df = 1] = 7.65, $p < .05$, $\varphi = .04$). Defenses have remained very rare throughout all years of announcement speeches and were excluded from these analyses.

Significant differences occurred between the 2008 and 2012 speeches analyzed here and those given in the 12 presidential campaigns before them. Whereas the 1960-2004 announcement speeches were split evenly between statements about policy (50%) and statements about character (50%), the speeches from 2008 and 2012 used more utterances about policy (58%) than character (42%) (χ^2 [df = 1] = 62.39, $p < .05$, $\varphi = .1$). These findings are consistent with post hoc analysis of the data from Benoit, Henson, Whalen, and Pier (2008), which revealed that announcement speeches emphasize policy more in recent years than early campaigns (r [n = 12] = .52, $p < .05$). As predicted by Petrocik's Issue Ownership theory (1996), these speeches tended to discuss issues owned by the party of the candidate giving the speech more than issues owned by the other party.

Conclusion

The analysis conducted here produced important information about the content of announcements of presidential candidacy. The results were generally consistent with functional analyses of other media types (candidates used more acclaims than attacks, discussed policy more than character, etc.). A comparison between these announcement speeches and those given in previous election years revealed both similarities and differences. The level of acclaims in the two most recent campaigns was roughly similar to prior campaigns but the 2008 and

2012 addresses discussed policy more, and character less, than in the past (in 2012 the Republicans used these topics about equally often). Acclaims are more common in announcement speeches than in other message forms from the early part of the campaign, such as primary television spots or primary debates (Benoit, 2007).

As in other Functional research, both general goals and ideals were used more often as the basis for acclaims than attacks. These candidates' speeches in 2008 also conformed to the predictions of Issue Ownership Theory (1996), with candidates discussing issues owned by their party more than they addressed issues owned by the opposing party. Any study has limitations and this one is no exception. Functional Theory, for example, does not look at candidates' use of metaphors or evidence. Clearly more work can be done understanding the messages that formally start the presidential election campaign.

References

Benoit, W. L. (2003). Topic of presidential campaign discourse and election outcome. *Western Journal of Communication, 67*(1), 97-112.

Benoit, W. L. (2004). Political party affiliation and presidential campaign discourse. *Communication Quarterly, 52*(2), 81-97.

Benoit, W. L. (2007). C*ommunication in political campaigns*. New York: Peter Lang.

Benoit, W. L., Henson, J., Whalen, S., & Pier, P. M. (2008). "I am a candidate for president": A functional analysis of presidential announcement speeches, 1960-2004. *Speaker & Gavel, 45*, 3-18.

Benoit, W. L., Wells, W. T., Pier, P. M., & Blaney, J. R. (1999). Acclaiming, attacking, and defending in nomination convention acceptance addresses, 1960-1996 *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 85*, 247-267.

Berelson, B. (1952). *Content analysis for the social sciences and humanities*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Blumenthal, S. (1980). *The permanent campaign: Inside the world of elite political operatives*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Bromley, D. B. (1993). *Reputation, image and impression management*. Chichester: Wiley.

Cain, H. (2011, May 21). Presidential candidacy announcement address. Retrieved from http://www.4president.org/speeches/2012/hermancain2012announcement.htm

Cohen, J. (1960). A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 20*(1), 37-46.

Diamond, E., & Bates, S. (1992). *The spot: The rise of political advertising on television* (3rd ed.). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Gingrich, N. (2011, May 11). Presidential candidacy announcement speech. Retrieved from http://www.4president.org/speeches/2012/newtgingrich2012announcement.htm

Holsti, O. (1969). *Content analysis in communication research*. New York: Free Press.

Huckabee, M. (2007, January 28). *Presidential candidacy announcement speech*. Retrieved from http://www.4president.org/speeches/2008/mikehuckabee2008announcement.htm

Kendall, K. E. (2000). *Communication in the presidential primaries: Candidates and the media, 1912-2000*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Landis, J. R., & Koch, G. G. (1977). The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data. *Biometrics, 33*(1), 159-174.

McCain, J. (September 27, 1999). *Presidential announcement speech: New Hampshire*.

Merritt, S. (1984). Negative political advertising: Some empirical findings. *Journal of Advertising, 13*(3), 27-38.

Obama, B. (2012, February 10). Presidential candidacy announcement speech. Retrieved from http://www.4president.org/speeches/2008/barackobama2008announcement.htm

Paul, R. (2011, May 13). Presidential candidacy announcement speech. Retrieved from http://www.4president.org/speeches/2012/ronpaul2012announcement.htm

Petrocik, J. R. (1996). Issue ownership in presidential elections, with a 1980 case study. *American Journal of Political Science, 40*(3), 825-850.

Popkin, S. L. (1994). *The reasoning voter: Communication and persuasion in presidential campaigns* (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Romney, M. (2011, June 2). Presidential candidacy announcement speech. Retrieved from http://www.4president.org/speeches/2012/mittromney2012announcement.htm

Santorum, R. (2011, June 6). Presidential candidacy announcement speech. Retrieved from http://www.4president.org/speeches/2012/ricksantorum2012announcement.htm

Stewart, C. J. (1975). Voter perception of mud-slinging in political communication. *Central States Speech Journal, 26*(4), 279-286.

Trent, J. S. (1978). Presidential surfacing: The ritualistic and crucial first act. *Communication Monographs, 45*(4), 281-292.

Trent, J. S. (1994). The early campaign. In R. E. Denton (Ed.), *The 1992 presidential campaign: A communication perspective* (pp. 43-64). New York: Praeger.

Trent, J. S. (1998). The beginning and the early end. In R. E. Denton (Ed.), *The 1996 presidential campaign: A communication perspective* (pp. 50-75). New York: Praeger.

Trent, J. S., & Friedenberg, R. V. (2004). *Political campaign communication: Principles and practices* (5th ed.). Westport, CT: Praeger

Authors' Notes:
The authors acknowledge the support of the Department of Communication Chair Michael Kramer, the College of Arts & Sciences Dean Michael O'Brien, Provost Brian Foster, and Chancellor Brady Deaton at the University of Missouri.

William L. Benoit, Ohio University
Mark Glantz, St. Norbert College.

Stressing a Developmental Approach Toward Persuasion in Interscholastic Forensics

Jim Schnell

A variety of models exist for teaching persuasive speaking to beginning speakers. A common shortcoming of models is that they require additional instruction to ensure student understanding. The Developmental Speech Sequence Model (DSSM) is an approach that can be applied effectively with beginning forensics competitors.

The 10-point model described in this report is detailed but it also allows the speaker degrees of creative freedom. Forensics coaches can modify use of this model depending on the experience and skill level of the beginning competitor, allowing for a more customized approach that can benefit the student. Ten points within three sections comprise the DSSM: introduction, body, and conclusion.

Justification for this approach is also recognized via the evolution of the information age and corresponding new communication technologies. These new communication technologies expand the forms and formats for expression and message creation. The benefits of this type of developmental approach establish primary points the speaker can use as guideposts. As current and future generations of students advance into forensics competition, they will benefit from these types of developmental themes.

Introduction

1. Opening (to orient the audience with the speaker)
2. Objective of Speech (to clarify the speaker's purpose)
3. Overview of Main Ideas (to orient the audience with the speaker's perspective on his/her purpose)

Body

1. Statement of Problem (The specific problem the speaker is trying to persuade the audience to overcome. State why the audience should be interested in the topic.)
2. Statement of Solution (The solution to the problem that the speaker is trying to persuade the audience to adopt.)
3. Statement of Rationale (Why the intended solution is the most logical answer to the problem.)
4. Statement of Implementation (How the intended solution can be put into effect. What action the audience needs to take.)

Conclusion

1. Review of Main Ideas (to summarize the speaker's perspective on his/her purpose)

2. Restatement of Objective (to ensure clarification and relevance of speaker purpose)
3. Closing (to acknowledge the audience's time and interest)

Use of the DSSM can best be exemplified through application of the model with an actual topic. The following three paragraphs highlight the DSSM through a persuasive presentation on teeth flossing. This topic was selected from a survey of mid-western forensics coaches regarding health care topics.

Introduction

1. Opening—"Good afternoon, my name is Mary Anne Smith...")
2. Objective of Speech—"Today I would like to talk to you about the need for teeth flossing..."
3. Overview—"Much of my presentation will describe findings from the American Dental Association [ADA] that substantiate the benefits of dental flossing...

Body

1. Statement of Problem—"The ADA reports 67% of all Americans will suffer from severe dental decay before the age of 70. Forty-eight percent of this group will have brushed regularly but still been unable to effectively combat tooth decay. Could you be in this one-third of our population?"
2. Statement of Solution—"I am moved to speak to you about this topic today because the ADA reports a vast majority of Americans suffering from severe tooth decay could avoid this painful situation simply by flossing their teeth daily..."
3. Statement of Rationale—"Although brushing with toothpaste is helpful and makes your mouth fresh, it is flossing with dental floss that removes food and plaque from between teeth and gums where tooth decay begins and does most damage..."
4. Statement of Implementation—You can begin to effectively fight tooth decay today. You can do it in five minutes in your home and it will cost about $1.50. Merely visit your local pharmacy, purchase a package of dental floss, and ask your pharmacist for flossing instructions. ADA flossing instructions are readily available from your pharmacy or local dentist office..."

Conclusion

1. Review—"Again, it is flossing that effectively fights tooth decay, not merely brushing..."
2. Restatement of Objective—"Your first step towards effective oral hygiene is less time consuming than washing your hair. This is not merely opinion. It is scientific fact."

3. Closing—"Awareness about this topic provided me with one simple way I can help keep my life time health care costs down. I hope our time together today has convinced you..."

The DSSM approach parallels the well-known Motivated Sequence developed by Alan Monroe (Ehninger, Gronbeck, McKerrow, & Monroe, 1986, pp. 153-155). An application of the DSSM posits the topic can be stated as a problem and this problem can be followed with a solution to the problem. Development of the solution outlines the intended results that can be realized. The DSSM, though somewhat similar to the Motivated Sequence, provides further elaboration in the areas of problem definition and solution implementation. This is not to suggest that a problem/solution type of development is the only approach that can be used for persuasive speaking in forensics competition.

Monroe describes the basic points of the Motivated Sequence in his original description of this model (Monroe, 1935, pp. vii-x). He outlines five steps: Attention, Need, Satisfaction, Visualization, and Action. The objective of the Attention Step is to gain and maintain the attention of the audience with a subtopic that is related to your primary topic. The Need Step poses a need (or reason) for the audience to be interested in your presentation. The Satisfaction Step provides an answer to the need. The Visualization Step describes results that can be attained by using the Satisfaction Step. The Action Step instructs what action needs to be taken to satisfy the established need. Both the Motivated Sequence and DSSM are appropriate in interscholastic forensics competition.

However, the DSSM's step-by-step approach can be especially helpful for the beginning competitor because of the additional direction. Forensics judging criteria can vary significantly and this can be confusing for the new competitor. When evaluating speeches using the DSSM, evaluation can be based on the DSSM main ideas. Other evaluation criteria can include: 1) assigned time frame; 2) delivery and adaptation to audience; 3) verbal and nonverbal factors; and, 4) ability to persuade to action. Thus, the beginning competitor can learn basic evaluation considerations and build from these as his/her skills become more sophisticated.

Persuasive speaking skills are obviously useful in forensics competition, the classroom, business, and the professions. The importance of persuasive speaking is emphasized from a number of perspectives. The following perspectives serve to clarify the role of persuasive speaking in contrast with informational speaking. Miller, Burgoon, and Burgoon (1984) offer a complete summary of attitude change research that describes the role of persuasive appeals. Basic research on latitudes of acceptance and rejection is developed by Sherif, Sherif, and Nebergall (1965). Liska (1978, pp. 85-92) outlines the role of credibility and how it varies from situation to situation and topic to topic. These perspectives help provide a foundation for contemporary persuasive speaking and they highlight relevant concerns. The DSSM clearly builds on these concerns.

Response to the DSSM has been positive. The beginning forensics competitor benefits from DSSM usage as he/she has a concrete understanding of process. Speakers deliver with increased confidence as they are fully aware of what

is expected of them (but not at the expense of creativity). As new speakers improve their persuasive skills they have a firm theoretical foundation from which to build and refer as needed.

The relevance of the DSSM is especially clear given developments with social interactive media. These new forms of communicative expression alter the interactive landscape that we function within. As such, young public speakers have grown in a period where there has been less structure regarding standard forms of persuasive development. The DSSM provides helpful underpinnings in this regard but not at the expense of innovative, and more spontaneous, expression that is a hallmark of the new communication technologies.

Looking toward the future, this type of framework will continue to benefit the grooming of young public speakers as it has an inherent flexibility that can be adapted to various applications regarding form and content. This type of flexibility will be essential as we experience the evolution of new communication technologies in that new forms of communication will spawn altered forms of logic and premises. Clarity and flexibility will continue to be beneficial.

References

Ehninger, D., Gronbeck, B. E., McKerrow, R. E., & Monroe, A. H. (1986). *Principles and types of speech communication*. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman, and Co.

Liska, J. (1978). Situational and topical variations in credibility criteria. *Communication Monographs*, 45, 85-92.

Miller, G., Burgoon, J. & Burgoon, M. (1984). The functions of human communication in changing attitudes and gaining compliance. In C. Arnold & J. Bowers (Eds.), *Handbook of rhetorical and communication theory* (pp. 400-474). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Monroe, A. H. (1935). *Principles and types of speech*. Chicago: Scott, Foresman, and Co.

Sherif, M., Sherif, C., & Nebergall, R. (1965). *Attitude and attitude change*. Philadelphia: Saunders.

Jim Schnell, Ph.D., Professor, Ohio Dominican University, 1216 Sunbury Road, Columbus, Ohio 43219, schnellj@ohiodominican.edu